DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 274 294 HE 019 773

TITLE	Catholic Secondary Schools and Colleges: Renewing the Partnership. Proceedings of the Symposium on Secondary School-College Collaboration (Anaheim, California, April 3-5, 1986).
INSTITUTION	Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.; National Catholic Educational Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Apr 86
NOTE	80p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Catholic Educational Association, 1077 30th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20007-3852 ($5.30 nonmembers, $4.00 members).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Articulation (Education); *Catholic Schools; *Church Related Colleges; College Curriculum; *College School Cooperation; *Cooperative Planning; Educational Objectives; Higher Education; *High Schools; Institutional Mission; Leadership Responsibility; Secondary Education; Secondary School Curriculum

ABSTRACT

Proceedings of the 1986 Symposium on Catholic Secondary School and College Collaboration are presented. In addition to outlining the background to the symposium, including meetings of National Catholic Education Association task forces, the activities and topics of the symposium and some outcomes are summarized. A brief statement of plans for college and secondary school partnerships are presented for the following regions: Northwest, West, North Central, South, Middle States, and New England. Symposium participants and their addresses are also listed, along with the organizations they represent. Included are four papers that address the four main topics of the conference: vision, mission, leadership, and curriculum. Paper titles and authors are as follows: "The Mission of the Catholic High School and the Catholic College, 1986" (John S. Cummins); "Catholic Secondary Schools and Colleges: Renewing the Vision" (Michael J. Guerra); "Leadership: Twenty-First Century Style" (Mary D. Griffin, Christine Fritz, Marla Loehr, August Rakoczy); and "Catholic Secondary Schools and Colleges: Partnership in a Continuous Curriculum" (Mary Peter Traviss). (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED274294

CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES:

RENEWING THE PARTNERSHIP

Proceedings of the Symposium on
Secondary School—College Collaboration
Anaheim, California
April 3-5, 1986

Sponsored by:
Department of Secondary Schools
and the
Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities
National Catholic Educational Association

Washington, D.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Association of Catholic Colleges & Universities/NCEA
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE019113

CONTENTS

Introduction
Catherine McNamee, C.S.J. 1

History and Process 3

Statement of Outcomes 9

Regional Plans 11

Appendix A: Participants 15

Appendix B: Conference Papers 21

The Mission of the Catholic High School and the Catholic College, 1986
Most Rev. John S. Cummins 21

Catholic Secondary Schools and Colleges: Renewing the Vision
Michael J. Guerra 35

Leadership: Twenty-First Century Style
Mary D. Griffin, et al. 51

Catholic Secondary Schools and Colleges: Partnership in a Continuous Curriculum
Mary Peter Traviss, O.P. 61

INTRODUCTION

Catherine McNamee, C.S.J.
President
National Catholic Educational Association

I have just returned to my office at NCEA after having had lunch with a prominent Catholic layman who greeted me with the following question: "How is it that you, who have spent the past decade or so in Catholic colleges and universities, are now willing to take on this broader responsibility of acting as spokesperson for *all* of Catholic education, including elementary and secondary schools?" The very fact that someone should pose such a question only serves to underscore the importance of the effort initiated at our Symposium on Catholic Secondary School -- College Collaboration held in Anaheim, California, April 3-5, 1986.

As Michael Guerra, Executive Director of NCEA's Secondary School Department, pointed out at that time, the relationship between all American colleges and schools -- public as well as private -- is a chasm in need of a bridge. Dr. Ernest Boyer, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, describes the situation in this way:

> Today, with all the talk about educational excellence, schools and colleges still live in two separate worlds. Presidents and deans rarely talk to principals and superintendents. College faculty do not meet with their counterparts...Curriculum reforms at every level are planned in isolation. It's such a simple point - the need for close collaboration - and yet it is a priority that has been consistently ignored.

The recently issued Carnegie Foundation report, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, also points out the importance of school-college relationships: "We invite leaders at the highest levels in colleges and universities to reassert the importance of educating outstanding teachers..."

As a former dean and president of colleges deeply committed to "educating outstanding teachers," I share this sense of

urgency regarding the need for school-college partnerships -- in both the private and the public sectors. As a *Catholic* educator, however, I feel an even greater sense of urgency. For it is especially our shared Christian vision that should draw us together in ways that transcend our shared professionalism. As the joint "Statement of Outcomes" resulting from the Anaheim symposium forcefully reminds us, "We are members of the same family, the same community of faith. We pursue a jointly-held sense of educational mission: the integration of faith and culture, academic excellence, service to the human community..."

How is it that I, who started out as a high school Spanish teacher and later became a teacher of teachers and a college administrator, would dare to take on the task of promoting these new partnerships in Catholic education? Simply stated, I believe in both the challenges and the opportunities our educational "system" provides. This current conversation between college and secondary school teachers and administrators is a good one -- and long overdue. It gives us a chance to appreciate how much has been accomplished in American Catholic education in the 19th and 20th centuries, and yet it opens up the questions that must be faced if this tradition of excellence and service is to flourish in the future.

A relevant quotation comes from the close of Jay Dolan's book on *The American Catholic Experience*: "A new spirit is alive in American Catholicism, and the twenty-first century belongs to it." So, too, for American Catholic education -- and this new collaborative spirit holds out both the hope and the promise of even greater things yet to come...

Washington, D.C.
September, 1986

HISTORY AND PROCESS

1. History

The process of meeting, planning, discussing and surveying which culminated in the Symposium on Catholic Secondary School -- College Collaboration in Anaheim on April 3-5, 1986 originated in the consistent interest of the National Catholic Educational Association in mutually-beneficial cooperative efforts. In 1982 NCEA published *The Pre-Service Formation of Teachers for Catholic Schools* and in 1983 *Models of School -- College Collaboration.* The task forces that prepared each publication represented several departments of NCEA.

The commission that developed *Models of School -- College Collaboration* recommended the formation of a successor joint task force, composed of representatives of the higher education and secondary schools departments of NCEA, to continue work on collaboration and to find ways of bridging the gap that often exists between Catholic secondary schools and colleges.

The members of the joint task force were: Michael Guerra, Executive Director, Secondary Schools Department, NCEA; Dr. Carol Kulpa, Memphis Diocesan Office of Education; William Lambert, F.M.S., Boston Archdiocesan Office of Education; John McGovern, C.S.C., Superintendent of Catholic Schools, Diocese of Syracuse, New York; David Johnson, Associate Executive Director, Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities (the higher education department of NCEA); Albert J. Hamilton, Dean, School of Arts and Sciences, Manhattan College (NY); Donna Jurick, S.N.D., President, Trinity College (DC); and William McInnes, S.J., President, Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities.

At its first meeting in Washington on December 5, 1983, the task force decided to focus its initial efforts upon developing a wide-ranging discussion among interested people. Some twenty university and college educators met with the task force at the ACCU Annual Meeting in January 1984. At that meeting some of the issues raised by the earlier commissions and publications were noted, and suggestions for improving collaboration were elicited from the attendees. These included joint efforts to strengthen basic skills education, to re-tool high school teachers, to encourage advanced students, and to develop dialogues between institutions and between individuals. Participants were particularly interested in establishing common understandings

about institutional interests in student formation.

In April of 1984 the task force heard from several groups at the NCEA Convention in Boston. A breakfast session with the Executive Committee of the Secondary Department and an open session for other interested individuals produced suggestions similar to those made at the ACCU session. A common theme that emerged was a wish for a continuing national dialogue. This expression became more focused as the task force held its own meetings throughout 1984 and early in 1985 and continued at the 1985 meetings of ACCU and NCEA in Washington and St. Louis respectively.

During this time the committee also prepared a questionnaire which was sent to some fifty leading Catholic secondary and postsecondary educators in the United States. Responses to six major questions were solicited: 1. What are the essentially shared elements of the educational mission of Catholic secondary and postsecondary institutions in the United States? 2. Are there contradictory and/or significantly different aspects of the mission of each sector that hinder the development of a sense of common mission? 3. What steps would you recommend taking to increase cooperation and/or articulation within the Catholic secondary and postsecondary communities? 4. Identify significant leaders in the Catholic sector -- both locally and nationally -- who can address the issues involved in secondary/postsecondary collaboration. 5. What, if anything, have you read, viewed, or heard recently that effectively and thoughtfully addresses issues of common concern for Catholic secondary and postsecondary education? 6. What ideas can you suggest on how best to encourage the development of both national and regional dialogues among Catholic secondary and postsecondary institutions?

Respondents identified a broad range of issues, as well as an impressive number of individuals recognized as leaders in each community. They also strongly supported the idea of a national meeting to initiate a continuing dialogue on a solid foundation.

After studying the responses, the task force formulated a proposal which secured a grant from the Rev. Michael J. McGivney Fund to develop a national invitational conference. The meeting was scheduled for April, 1986, following the NCEA Convention in Anaheim, California. The goal of the conference was to establish guidelines for a nationwide grid of local collaborative and supportive efforts in the service of Catholic education.

During the spring and summer of 1985 the committee worked to construct a conference agenda, identify conferees and possible principal speakers. In September, members of the task force settled on four topics to be addressed at the national conference: Vision, Mission, Leadership, and Curriculum. It was agreed that the presenters of these topics should prepare papers to be distributed prior to the conference so that the meeting itself could be structured to elicit optimum participation.

The following individuals were invited to address these main topics: Most Rev. John S. Cummins, Bishop of Oakland (Mission), Dr. Mary Griffin of Boston College (Leadership), Michael J. Guerra of NCEA (Vision), and Sister Mary Peter Traviss, O.P. of the University of San Francisco (Curriculum). Because their papers were mailed to the conferees a month before the conference, little time was spent on formal presentations at the conference itself. Each of the authors made brief presentations and then joined the other participants in a two and one-half day conversation. Dr. Donna Jurick, SSND, a member of the task force, arranged the conference program and guided the participants through the sessions, designed to encourage extensive and candid exchange as well as regional consensus and commitment.

2. Process

Conversation was the *sine qua non* of the Anaheim conference. Participants had been invited on the basis of their ability to contribute to the dialogue at the conference itself and to be catalysts for the continuance of that dialogue in their regions. The conference began at 3 p.m. on the opening day, included a fully scheduled second day, and concluded at noon on the third day. The evening meal on both the first and second days was an integral part of the conference.

At the opening session the four speakers could presume that participants already had read their prepared papers. They accordingly sought to extend their own and the participants' thoughts regarding the topics of vision, mission, leadership, and curriculum by highlighting significant issues, questions, and possibilities as points of departure for discussion. Subsequently, the speakers became listeners as participants reflected on what they had read and heard in an initial effort to identify those issues regarding which this conference should attempt to come to some resolution. Finally the four presenters, incorporating reflections on their own and each others' papers as well as the

ideas and directions generated during the large group discussion, suggested the emerging focus for the next morning's work sessions on the four conference topics.

Since regional follow-up was an expected outcome of the conference, seating at dinner was arranged in regional groupings, based upon geographic divisions established by accrediting agencies serving both secondary and postsecondary institutions. Informal conversation provided an opportunity to come to know one another better and understand each others' reasons for accepting the invitation to participate.

On the second day, conference participants convened for opening prayer and a presentation of the process for the morning work sessions. Four simultaneous work sessions followed. Regional participants had organized themselves in such a way as to ensure representation at each of the topic sessions on Vision, Mission, Leadership, and Curriculum. The conference planning committee provided a facilitator for each session. These sessions moved the conference from brainstorming to discussions. Expressions of both agreement and disagreement were encouraged. It was suggested that each group consider the following:

1. Describe what is means to be a Catholic secondary school; a Catholic college or university. Given these understandings: What do we share? How are we different?
2. Describe your understanding of vision (or mission, curriculum or leadership, depending on the group's focus) from the perspective of a Catholic secondary school and from the perspective of a Catholic college or university. Given these understandings: What do we share? How are we different?
3. Given our discussion of "what we share" and "how we differ," where do we go from here in terms of collaboration?
4. Are there topics specific to a given region that need to inform our general discussion?

While participants enjoyed a leisurely lunch on their own, the conference committee, including the facilitators for the work sessions, met to review the morning sessions and set the agenda for the afternoon. After lunch a summary of each of the preceding topic sessions was presented to the conference by a

spokesperson chosen by each group. Notes of the presented summaries were subsequently typed and distributed. The reports demonstrated a convergence of the four topics; that is, the point of discussion (no matter which topic was considered) had become the shared and differing perspectives of secondary schools and colleges/universities. The critical question for the conference thus became: given these shared and divergent perspectives, what, if anything, could we as a total group say about collaboration between the two sectors?

Immediately following the reporting session, regional groups met to reflect on the direction the conference was taking and the implications of this for its regional planning, and to ascertain the influence the regional membership would like to exert on any developing conference position on school -- college partnership. A further task of this meeting was the identification of regional leadership to facilitate post-conference follow-up.

At the afternoon meeting of the topic work sessions (same membership as morning sessions) the participants, as indicated at the reporting session, dropped the specific topic focus and concentrated on the question of possible collaboration given their shared and diverging perspectives. The possibility and advisability of an action-oriented conference statement as well as ideas for inclusion in it were raised and discussed.

Following liturgy and dinner (again in regional groups) the conference committee met. After extensive discussion of what had been observed and heard, including the specification of topics considered at length and those set aside for later, a conference statement was drafted for the review of the conference membership.

The final day began with a presentation of an outline for the report to be published as the permanent record of the conference, followed by a quick review of the topics considered and touched upon over the past few days. The major work of this session was the presentation and review of the proposed conference statement, described as the coordinating committee's summation of the conversation that had taken place. Detailed notes were taken of participants' comments. The conference committee agreed to review these comments and revise the statement before it was included in the conference proceedings.

Regional meetings followed in which plans for specific actions were finalized and leadership responsibilities at both the secondary and college/university levels specified. Finally, the entire group reconvened and in a context of prayer and com-

mitment heard the plans of each region, celebrated our communal purposes that transcend diversity, and rejoiced in being blessed and sent forth.

11

CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES: RENEWING THE PARTNERSHIP

Statement of Outcomes

We have joined together in conversation, not for the first time nor the last, to hear and understand each other's concerns. We do so far too infrequently.

We have made a beginning, again. We have reminded ourselves of all that binds us together. We are members of the same family, the same community of faith. We pursue a jointly-held sense of educational mission: the integration of faith and culture, academic excellence, service to the human community. We worry together about whether we'll have sufficient funds and personnel to reach those aims in the years ahead. We are each engaged in an ongoing process of clarifying our identity as Catholic institutions in changing contexts. And we recognize that Catholic education at its best is holistic in nature, that its unique potential lies in its ability to guide intellectual and spiritual formation throughout the life cycle, and that weakness on any level of our collective enterprise eventually weakens all others. We are, in these ways and many others, one.

In other ways we are two, and likely to remain so. We are separated by language and mores, and our institutions emphasize differing aspects of the educational mission we hold in common. We do not underestimate the width or depth of the chasm which divides us. Yet we accept the distinctiveness of each level, and have come to a better understanding of the differing contexts within which our colleagues operate. We value our independence as well, and derive strength from the pursuit of particular institutional charisms within the broader tradition of Catholic education.

Yet we affirm that our sense of common purpose remains strong and should become stronger. We have much to learn from each other -- and much yet to learn together -- about living the Catholic tradition in a pluralistic society: about the best ways to improve our service to the poor; about infusing others, particularly our faculties, with the vision necessary to sustain our Catholic identity in the years ahead; about forming effective partnerships among lay persons and religious, Catholics and non-Catholics, schools and colleges. Together we pledge to continue

these conversations and work toward greater collaboration in the future. We have committed ourselves to specific objectives within the coming year, and will account to each other on our progress. We invite our colleagues not present to join in this effort.

Anaheim, California
April 5, 1986

CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES: RENEWING THE PARTNERSHIP

Regional Plans

1. Northwest Region:

Co-Chairs: Mary Tracy, SNJM, Principal, Holy Names Academy, Seattle, Washington
Jeanne Wardian, Dean of Education, Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington

Initial Plans: Co-chairs will meet with symposium colleagues Bernard Streckler and Patrick Clark in May, 1986, to plan a meeting of representatives from regional secondary schools, colleges, universities and diocesan school systems and to seek a joint letter of support for this project from the region's bishops, superintendents, and college/university presidents. The anticipated meeting will focus on the conference statement as a starting point for dialogue on interests, concerns, issues and possible cooperative or collaborative activities.

2. Western Region:

Co-Chairs: James Loughran, SJ, President, Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles, California
Cecilia Louise Moore, CSJ, Associate Superintendent, Archdiocese of Los Angeles

Initial Plans: Will attempt to arrange a state-wide meeting of the California bishops, diocesan superintendents or other appropriate representatives of the secondary schools, and Catholic college/university presidents in order to identify concerns and possible concrete forms of collaboration. If the state-wide meeting is successful, regional meetings in San Diego, Los Angeles, and the Bay area will be conducted, with the guest list expanded to include deans, principals, and others.

3. North Central Region:

Co-Chairs: Lawrence Keller, FSC, Principal, Cardinal Ritter College Preparatory High School Clayton, Missouri
Thomas Trebon, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Missouri

Initial Plans: North Central Association meeting in Chicago in March, 1987 should provide a setting for a regional meeting, using the symposium statement as a starting point. Possible sponsorship of regional activities during Catholic Schools Week. Co-chairs will collect and distribute regional examples of collaboration.

4. **Southern Region**:

Co-chairs: Carol Kulpa, Diocesan Office of Education, Memphis, Tennessee
Jeanne O'Laughlin, OP, President, Barry University, Miami Shores, Florida

Initial Plans: The following areas of mutual interest were identified for proposed collaboration/communication: the curriculum and learning continuum; models of collegiality; teacher training; educating teachers and counselors about the Catholic college; and recruiting students. An effort will also be made to bring Catholic elementary schools into collaborative activities. Through consultation with symposium colleagues, the co-chairs will try to arrange discussions at the Southern Association (SACS) meeting and/or the Southern regional meeting of ACCU. In this vast region, the Catholic colleges are seen as places where more localized conversations can occur; the co-chairs will propose the development of local forums at those sites.

5. **Middle States Region**:

Co-Chairs: Joseph Mahon, FSC, Director of Education, Brothers of the Christian Schools, Adamstown, Maryland
Robert J. Starratt, SJ, Director, Center for Non-Public Education, Fordham University, NY

Initial Plans: Co-chairs Mahon and Starratt will work initially through their own congregations. Mahon will work toward a meeting in the fall of 1986 between representatives of secondary schools served by the Baltimore Province of the Christian Brothers and representatives of LaSalle University. The focus of the meeting will be on the Catholic identity of the schools and the ways that schools and the University can be mutually-supportive. If the meeting proves successful, LaSalle will be encouraged to arrange a similar meeting with representatives of other Catholic secondary schools in the Philadelphia area.

Co-chair Starratt will initiate a similar effort involving the secondary schools and colleges served by the Jesuits of the New York Province. Attempts will also be made to initiate cooperative programs involving both the Christian Brothers and the Jesuits in cities where both serve secondary schools and colleges.

Symposium participants not affiliated with these two congregations are invited to formulate additional plans for regional follow-up.

6. New England Region:

Co-Chairs: William Lambert, FMS, Educational Development Team, Archdiocese of Boston, Massachusetts
Mary Griffin, Dean, School of Education, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

Initial Plans: All symposium participants from the region will serve as a committee to plan future events. Phase I will involve spreading the word about the Anaheim symposium to colleagues at all levels of Catholic education. Phase II: the committee will meet in June, 1986 to plan a conference replicating the Anaheim meeting, to be held in academic year 1986-87.

7. **National Catholic Educational Association**:

Co-chairs: Michael Guerra, Executive Director, Secondary Schools Department, NCEA
David Johnson, Associate Director, Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities/NCEA

Initial Plans: Will consult with regional co-chairs as needed. Will attempt to schedule sessions at 1987 NCEA and ACCU Annual Meetings as follow-up to Anaheim. Will coordinate production of symposium publication.

APPENDIX A

Catholic Secondary Schools and Colleges: Renewing the Partnership

Participants

1. Northwest Association: Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington

Sister Jojean Cavalli, Department of Education, University of Portland, 500 N. Willamette, Portland, OR 97203

Rev. Patrick Clark, Superintendent of Schools, Archdiocese of Seattle, 910 Marion Street, Seattle, WA 98104

Bernard M. Steckler, Matteo Ricci College--II, Seattle University, Seattle, WA 98122

Sister Mary Tracy, SNJM, Principal, Holy Names Academy, 728 21st Avenue East, Seattle, WA 98112

Dr. Jeanne Wardian, Dean of Education, Gonzaga University, Spokane, WA 99258

2. Western Association: California, Hawaii, Guam, Pacific Trust Territories

Rev. Dennis R. Clark, Superintendent of Schools, Diocese of San Diego, P.O. Box 11277, San Diego, CA 92111

Sister Kathleen Kelly, CSJ, Dean, Doheny Campus, Mount St. Mary College, 12001 Chalon Road, Los Angeles, CA 90049

Edward F. DeRoche, Dean, School of Education, University of San Diego, Alcala Park, San Diego, CA 92110

Rev. James M. Loughran, SJ, President, Loyola Marymount University, 7101 W. 80th Street, Los Angeles, CA 90045

Sister Cecilia Louise Moore, CSJ, Associate Superintendent, Secondary Education, Archdiocese of Los

Angeles, 1520 West 9th Street, Los Angeles, CA 90015

Msgr. Jeremiah T. Murphy, Superintendent of Secondary Schools, Archdiocese of Los Angeles, 1520 West 9th Street, Los Angeles, CA 90015

Sister Aileen Regan, PBVM, Assistant Superintendent, Archdiocese of San Francisco, 443 Church Street, San Francisco, CA 94114

3. North Central Association: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Rev. Russell M. Bleich, Superintendent of Education, Archdiocese of Dubuque, P.O. Box 479, Dubuque, IA 52001

Rev. Eugene E. Grollmes, SJ, St. Louis University, 221 N. Grand Boulevard, St. Louis, MO 63103

Rev. James Heft, SM, Religious Studies Department, University of Dayton, Dayton, OH 45469

Bro. Lawrence Keller, FSC, Principal, Cardinal Ritter College Preparatory High School, 921 University Lane, Clayton, MO 63105

Sister Anne C. Leonard, CND, Director of Educational Services, Archdiocese of Chicago, P.O. Box 1979, Chicago, IL 60690

John G. Nemo, Dean, College of St. Thomas, P.O. Box 5051, 2115 Summit Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55105

Sister Nancy Thompson, Principal, Mercy High School, 29300 11 Mile Road, Farmington Hills, MI 48010

Rev. Terrance Travis, Superintendent of Schools, Diocese of Steubenville, 422 Washington Street, Steubenville, OH 43952

Dr. Thomas J. Trebon, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Rockhurst College, 5225 Troost, Kansas City, MO 64110

Rev. John Whitley, CSB, Principal, Andrean High School, 5959 Broadway, Merrillville, IN 46410

4. Southern Association: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia

Dr. Louis Castenell, Dean, Xavier University of Louisiana, 7325 Palmetto Street, New Orleans, LA 70125

Sister Margaret Daues, CSJ, 2500 Line Avenue, Shreveport, LA 71104

Rev. William Davis, OSFS, Superintendent of Schools, Diocese of Arlington, 200 North Glebe Road, Suite 703, Arlington, Virginia 22203

Bro. Theodore Drahmann, FSC, President, Christian Brothers College, 650 East Parkway South, Memphis, TN 38104

Dr. Carol M. Kulpa, Diocesan Office of Education, P.O. Box 41679, 1325 Jefferson Avenue, Memphis, TN 38174-1679

Sister Jeanne O'Laughlin, OP, President, Barry University, 11300 NE 2nd Avenue, Miami Shores, FL 33161

Sister Audrey O'Mahony, Assistant to the Academic Vice President, Incarnate Word College, 4301 Broadway, San Antonio, TX 78209

Patricia A. Tierney, Coordinator for Schools, Diocese of St. Augustine, P.O. Box 24000, Jacksonville, FL 32241

5. Middle States Association: Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands

Dr. Patricia A. Bauch, OP, School of Education, The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC 20064

Bro. Patrick Ellis, FSC, President, La Salle University, Philadelphia, PA 19141

Dr. Albert J. Hamilton, College of Arts and Sciences, Manhattan College, Manhattan College Parkway, Riverdale, NY 10471

Dr. Donna Jurick, SNDdeN, President, Trinity College, Michigan Avenue, Washington, DC 20017

Bro. Joseph Mahon, FSC, Director of Education, Brothers of Christian Schools, Box 29, Adamstown, MD 21710

Bro. John McGovern, CSC, Superintendent of Catholic Schools, 240 East Onondaga Street, Syracuse, NY 13202

Rev. Robert J. Starratt, SJ, Director, Center for Non-Public Education, Graduate School of Education, Fordham University, Lincoln Center, New York, NY 10023

6. New England Association: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont

Dr. Philip DiMattia, 30 Ravine Terrace, Melrose, MA 02176

Sister Mary A. Dooley, SSJ, President, College of Our Lady of the Elms, Chicopee, MA 01013

Rev. Henry Frascadore, President, Northwest Catholic High School, 29 Wampanoag Drive, West Hartford, CT 06117

Bro. William Lambert, FMS, Educational Development Team, Archdiocese of Boston, 468 Beacon Street, Boston, MA 02115

Rev. Eugene Sullivan, Superintendent of Schools, Archdiocese of Boston, 468 Beacon Street, Boston, MA 02115

Sister Patricia James Sweeney, SSJ, Principal, Cathedral High School, 260 Surrey Road, Springfield, MA 01118

7. **Representatives of National Associations:**

Rev. Charles Costello, SJ, President-Designate, Jesuit Secondary Education Association (JSEA), Novitiate of St. Isaac Jogues, Church Road, Wernersville, PA 19565

Rev. Vincent J. Duminuco, SJ, President, JSEA, 1726 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20009

Sister Alice Gallin, OSU, Executive Director, Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, 1 Dupont Circle, Suite 650, Washington, DC 20036

Michael J. Guerra, Executive Director, Secondary Schools Department, National Catholic Educational Association, Suite 100, 1077 30th Street NW, Washington, DC 20007

Most Rev. William A. Hughes, Chair, NCCB Committee on Education, Bishop of Covington, P.O. Box 192, Covington, KY 44012

David M. Johnson, Associate Director, Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, Suite 650, 1 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036

Rev. William McInnes, SJ, President, Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, 1424 16th Street, NW, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20036

Sister Catherine McNamee, CSJ, President-Designate, National Catholic Educational Association, 435 Clay Avenue, Scranton, PA 18510

Rev. J. Stephen O'Brien, Executive Director, Chief Administrators of Catholic Education (NCEA), Suite 100, 1077 30th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20007

Ms. Judith Wojick, Administrative Assistant, Secondary Department, National Catholic Educational Association, Suite 100, 1077 30th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20007

8. Speakers

Most Rev. John S. Cummins, Bishop of Oakland, 2900 Lakeshore Avenue, Oakland, CA 94610

Dr. Mary D. Griffin, Dean, School of Education, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02167

Michael J. Guerra, Executive Director, Secondary Schools Department, NCEA, Suite 100, 1077 30th Street NW, Washington, DC 20036

Sister Mary Peter Traviss, O.P., Institute for Leadership, University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94117

APPENDIX B

Conference Papers

THE MISSION OF THE CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL AND THE CATHOLIC COLLEGE, 1986

Most Rev. John S. Cummins
Bishop of Oakland

The suggestion of this topic appealed to me in the light of the experience of the last twenty-five years. I come as a product of Catholic schools. Five years I was on the faculty of a Catholic high school. I did campus ministry at the college level for eighteen years, divided between a state university in California and a private non-sectarian college. For six years, I was secretary of the California bishops, serving both superintendents and religious educators at the state level as well as the campus ministers. On one occasion we sponsored a meeting of Catholic college presidents and bishops. Had I realized this paper would someday be the result of my experience, I would have observed more carefully.

What I have is a strong impression of a generation ago, perhaps 1960 or 1965. There was great encouragement from Catholic high schools toward moving their graduates into Catholic colleges and universities. So strong was the conviction that at times some uncongenial tactics were used, such as delaying transcripts to state universities.

At the same time the Catholic colleges reached out to leadership in the Catholic high schools, arranging exclusive campus visits and encouraging people with scholarship aid.

On the secular campus, the Newman apostolate realized that their people served on the fringe of campus life. They furthermore faced the attitude of much of Catholic leadership that the secular college presented a danger to faith. I remember in the 1950's a picture story covering a new Newman Center at the University of Minnesota that appeared in the *Catholic Digest*. There was an outcry from Catholic college administrators of what was seen as an enticement to secular eduction. This reaction would be considerably different from the mind of

Archbishop Patrick W. Riordan of San Francisco when he established the Newman Center in Berkeley in 1906 because of the expectation of growth in numbers of Catholics attending the state institutions.

My judgment is that twenty-five years ago those of us in Catholic high school work and collegiate campus ministry presumed a continuum of mission between the Catholic high school and the Catholic university.

The present scene has changed. High schools do not favor Catholic colleges over other institutions. The accepted explanation of this is that economics are a very strong factor. Yet at the same time in which our Catholic high schools have moved up the ladder of academic success, there seems to be a growing appreciation of Stanford, Yale, Dartmouth, Harvard as marks of success for their graduates. Traditionally people of means have looked for the highest quality education, but I believe this reality puts a dent in the prevailing economic explanation. Most Catholic families, so far as I am aware, although faithful to Catholic high school education, do not plan, often enough because of finances, for Catholic college education, but they do not raise a serious question of the difference. Even Catholic college faculty in my experience, though strong in their belief of the value of their own institutions, are not perceptibly vocal about the preference for Catholic higher education.

The difference in attitudes within a generation receives its explanation from the changes that have taken place in the Church and society these past years. "Simplistically stated," an acquaintance of mine has written, "the goals of education for the Catholic schools are essentially the same as they have always been, for these goals are those of the mission of the Church itself." Most Reverend G. Emmett Carter, in his introduction to the Document on Education from the Second Vatican Council, gives some hints and encouragement that as the Church goes so goes her education. He said that Catholic education now does not take people from the world but places them in and for the world. The goal of education is the integration of the Christian to the whole pattern of human life in all its aspects, as opposed to keeping Christians away from the world lest they be contaminated. He goes on to say, "The preoccupation of this historic meeting has been the adjustment of Christian thinking to the modern world." Bishop Carter speaks of this as the present world, not saying whether it is good or bad, just that the Church must be incarnate in it.

I hope this inquiry can look at the changes of the last

twenty-five years, see what is obviously accountable to the thrust of the Second Vatican Council, then evaluate what remains for investigation, analysis and questioning.

I. The Mission of Education in the Church

The base for discussion of this issue can be laid in the declaration on Christian education from the Second Vatican Council, *Gravisimum Educationis*. The reputation of this document is that it is among the less read and less admired of the over sixteen produced by the Council. In its own way, however, it reflects not just the tradition but emphasizes the change in the Church, and therefore in education, that is reflected in the thrust of the other documents.

The mission of Catholic education is primarily, of course, religious. This is stated elaborately in many paragraphs. "As the baptized person is gradually introduced into a knowledge of the mystery of salvation, he or she may daily grow more conscious of the gift of faith which he or she has received, that he may learn to adore God the Father ... especially through liturgical worship, that he may be trained to conduct his personal life in righteousness and in the sanctity of truth."[2]

The document goes on that students should give witness to the hope that is in them. They additionally should contribute to the upbuilding of the Body of Christ.[3]

A second goal is the development of the human person and the encouragement of the maturing of the gifts and talents of the individual student.

A third major issue is the welfare of the earthly city. Whatever knowledge of the world and of creation in the Catholic institution is enlivened by the spirit of the Gospel. Moreover, what arose in the pontificates of Pius X and Pius XI is elaborately stated, that there must be a transformation of the world and that the purpose of education is to foster the good of society as a whole.[4]

There are lesser emphases, but significant ones for the American scene. The Council records its cordial esteem for the new churches in the world, and especially for their non-Catholic students.[5] It includes as well, indeed as expected, not just the unevangelized but also the poor.[6]

Schools are given a very special importance. They are to instruct the intellect, improve the culture, instill values and prepare for the professions. This is to be done in an atmosphere of freedom and charity, and there is a tribute paid to schools

that attend to very special needs.[7]

The Council calls for a coordination between Catholic schools.[8]

It goes on to state its preocupation with higher learning, the world of research and analysis, the arena where faith and reason harmonize truth. Higher education is to move toward advancing culture, relieving societies' burdens and giving witness of faith to the world. Among its major responsibilities is to encourage its best students to move into the teaching profession.

The main elements seem to be religion, individual development and service of the world. Vatican II moves with a complex projection, but religious instruction and formation, the fullest development of the individual, with clear implication within community, and the welfare of the earthly city seem to be the most prominent directions.

II. How Catholic Higher Education and Secondary Education Reflect These Thrusts Together

The National Conference of Catholic Bishops has produced two documents that have preeminence in this area, namely the *National Catechetical Directory* and the 1972 document, *To Teach as Jesus Did*. It is this latter that is especially pertinent to our discussion.

To Teach as Jesus Did brought out twin purposes in Catholic education, personal sanctification and social reform in the light of Christian values. It made the issue of community central to educational ministry. It stated that the bishops have charged all the educational ministries, including the schools, with an apostolic mission to the world.

The document has been considered as a valid approach to a statement of national purpose in Catholic education in describing the educational mission of the Church as an integrated ministry embracing three interlocking dimensions: the message revealed by God which the Church proclaims; fellowship in the life of the Holy Spirit; and service to the Christian community and to the entire human community. These are the values of doctrine, community, service.

The Catholic educational institution is authentic in doctrine and contemporary in presentation. Religious truth and values are to be so presented that the students may realize their underlying reality and achieve coherence and meaning in both their learning and their living.

Secondly, it is the aim of Catholic education to build a

community to foster the Gospel spirit of peace, brotherhood, love, patience and respect for others. It is in this environment that young people can learn together of human needs, whether in the parish, the neighborhood, the local civic community or the world, and begin to respond to the obligations of Christian service through joint action.

Finally, there is the institutional commitment of serving the public interest, the American educational enterprise and the moral and spiritual welfare of the nation.

It is along with and through this translation that Catholic higher education and secondary education have a preoccupation with what it means to be Catholic. Often enough the word "Christian" is used, again coming out of perhaps the scriptural and traditional understanding of who we are as a people, but partially because of the diversity of student bodies at both levels. Integral to this is the matter of religious instruction, given in classes at the high school level and through departments at the university level. Institutional mission statements are likely to say that their goals center on Christ. There further may be explicit testimony that the Catholic institution educates to the Christian aspect of all its disciplines and plays out its values in all the approaches to truth.

While preparing good Christians is the goal of Catholic education, the statement is as easily found relating to the preparation of good citizens. This is the point of personal growth, social growth, professional development. The NCEA superintendents will relate this to knowledge, freedom and love.[9]

Our educational institutions will talk of the spirit of community. They will name as well moral responsibility and respect for the human person.

There is in the American scene an ecumenical dimension in that we wish to expose the non-Christian and the non-Catholic to the tradition of the Church.

The understanding is clear that Catholic institutions are no longer havens from the world. The Vatican Council has made it our cause to promote effectively the welfare of the earthly city and bring the reign of God to reality. This means special attention to the poor as well as to the unevangelized, all of which is to be carried out in an atmosphere of freedom of conscience, parental rights and progress of culture.

There is an ease, apparently, in American education circles that our history has prepared us well for the present generation's thrusts, given the establishment early on of the experimental method of learning, self-direction and self-discipline

in students and the democratic ideal of education.

III. The Varying Application of the Mission

1. The Distinctive College Reflection:

The president of the University of San Francisco not long ago indicated that the mission of higher eduction is more than academic. It is to promote the human and it is to develop the participating individual. This is more than a recent theme. Many, indeed, interpret Christian responsibility in this age as the common discerning of the mission of one's work and therefore the participatory development of the sense of mission in the Catholic institution.

It is well to note many of the changes that higher education has faced in this country beyond the stimuli of the Second Vatican Council. Statistics are not entirely clear, but it seems there was great growth in Catholic colleges and universities between 1965 and 1975. This was the same period that all of American higher education grew from 4,900,000 to 9,500,000 students. As the G.I. bill had made its impact in the 1940s and 1950s, so the federal Higher Education Act of 1963 sponsoring student aid made for growth.

To Teach as Jesus Did in 1972 spoke of "the critically important contribution made by Catholic institutions to their commitment to the spiritual, intellectual and moral values of the Christian tradition ...The Church itself looks to its colleges and universities to serve it by deep and thorough study of Catholic beliefs in an atmosphere of intellectual freedom and according to canons of intellectual criticism which should govern all pursuit of truth."[10]

The document says also that the college and university seek to give the authentic Christian message an institutional presence in the academic world. Several things follow from this. Christian commitment will characterize this academic community. While fully maintaining the autonomy concomitant to it being a college or university, the institution will manifest fidelity to the teaching of Jesus Christ as transmitted by his Church. It will be strongly committed to academic excellence and the responsible academic freedom required for effective teaching and research. Theology in the Catholic university will encourage students to explore beyond the limits of a narrow vision of life which excludes the religious dimension. The Department of Theology is a vital resource to the Catholic com-

munity outside the university and must be aware of its responsibility to that community.[11]

I am reminded of a friend of mine who has remarked that the Catholic university is the place where the Church can think.

The American bishops would add another approach in their statement on Catholic higher education (November 13, 1980), stating that Catholic higher education serves the Church in three indispensable ways. Catholic college and universities strive to bring faith and reason into an intellectually disciplined and constructive encounter. In addition, they are called to be communities of faith and worship that provide the young men and women of our country and Church with opportunities to mature in mind, body, heart and soul. Finally, our schools are serving increasingly the educational needs of adults as they seek to advance their learning at various stages of their lives.

The bishops go on to quote Pope John Paul II at The Catholic University of America that these higher institutions, "must train young men and women of outstanding knowledge who, having made a personal synthesis between faith and culture, will be both capable and willing to assume tasks in the service of the community of society in general and to bear witness to their faith before the world."[12]

From another tack Father Theodore Hesburgh, CSC, in a letter to the American bishops (July 24, 1981), quoted the 1972 document, *The Catholic University in the Modern World*, from the Second Congress of Delegates of the Catholic Universities of the World, as noting four essential characteristics of the Catholic university: 1. the Christian inspiration not only of individuals but of the university as such; 2. a continuing reflection in the light of the Catholic faith upon the growing treasury of human knowledge to which it seeks to contribute by its own research; 3. fidelity to the Christian message as it comes to us through the Church; 4. an institutional commitment to the service of the people of God and of the human family and their pilgrimage to the transcendent goal which gives meaning to life.

The sentence that immediately follows these four items represents an unfinished problem. "All universities that realize these fundamental conditions are Catholic universities, whether canonically erected or not."[13]

A competent observer remarked about the waves of Vatican II washing the shores of Catholic colleges and universities that were already in the 1960s seeking to cope with many other changes. There came along the emphases on shared

authority, on ecumenism and on updated liturgies. Educational leaders felt that the Church renewal process suggested a clearer distinction between the Church and academe.

The statement from Land O'Lakes, Wisconsin, in 1968 made the point of "true autonomy and academic freedom in the face of authority of whatever kind, lay or clerical, external to the academic community itself."[14]

The NCEA in 1976 attempted to clarify this sometimes delicate, sometimes tense issue by saying that the identity of the institution as Catholic is reaffirmed by the many ways in which service is given to the Catholic community, namely in fostering theological research and study, building faith communities, encouraging ecumenical activities and providing more dialogue on issues of concern to the Church. The relation with Church authority that stresses leadership rather than juridical control "is not only possible, it has proven to be successful."[15]

The American bishops in their own documents are hopeful, perhaps not altogether persuasively so. They indicate that the cordial and fruitful dialogue on the relationship of the Catholic college and university to the Church should benefit the entire Catholic community. In 1980 they encouraged the universities to develop ways to bring bishops and theologians together in examination of theological issues, to recall and to work for that "delicate balance between the autonomy of the Catholic university and the responsibilities of the hierarchy. There need be no conflict between the two."[16]

2. The Application of Mission to the High School:

The high school is thoroughly established at present but it was the last arrival as an important institution in American Catholic education. The men's college held sway as the prime educational institution, largely because of the hopes of developing clerical leadership. In 1884 the Baltimore Council gave direction to the founding of high schools and colleges for the encouragement of the mix that was the same institution at one point of our history, but the parish elementary school was in the forefront. The real notice for the high school came in the 1900s.

Jay Dolan of the University of Notre Dame remarks that the schools were established for three reasons. One was the need for religious instruction at a time when the shift from the primacy of family moved to the school and formal religious education moved to formal religious instruction. The second reason, of course, was the development of the common school

system and the rejection of the Protestant ideology that informed them. The third was the commitment of Catholic immigrant groups to hand on the faith according to their own cultural traditions. For most foreign language groups, both religion and language were major influences in the commitment to support separate schools.[17]

In 1966, Father Albert Koob would affirm a statement by the policies committee of the Secondary Schools Department of the NCEA from April, 1944 that "the broad aims of a philosophy of education for the modern Catholic high school are to develop, one, intelligent Catholics; two, spiritually vigorous Catholics; three, cultured Catholics; four, healthy Catholics; five, vocationally prepared Catholics; six, social minded Catholics; and seven, American Catholics." In addition to intellectual and moral formation, which are the chief concerns, the program includes both vocational guidance and counseling for social integration and for all problems of the adolescent.[18]

A decade later the President of NCEA, Monsignor John F. Meyers, reported on the questioning of Catholic schools that took place after the Second Vatican Council. His conclusion was "the need for an effective means of religious and moral education for youth continues to support the demand for Catholic schools." The NCEA superintendents' committee on goals in that same year embraced explicitly the bishops' pastoral in 1972 claiming that it perhaps approached a statement of national purpose in describing the educational mission of the Church as an integrated ministry embracing three interlocking dimensions that have already been alluded to; the message (*didache*); fellowship (*koinonia*); service (*diakonia*).[19]

That conclusion seems to have continued to this day. There is emphasis on religious instruction and campus ministry in the high school. The statement of the Secondary Schools Department of NCEA (1977), agrees that the Catholic high school should be a community of believers in Jesus Christ. High schools speak, too, as the colleges do, about the transformation of society, but nuance it in a way peculiar to the concreteness and locality of their situation and draw it up much more in terms of service.[20]

IV. Directions and Questions

There are good reasons for the accepted division in our own minds between Catholic elementary and secondary schools and the step up to higher education. Age of the student is a

factor. The organization of class and curriculum as well as the element of research makes a significant difference. In general, colleges, and universities look to the region or even to the nation and the international community for students, whereas the high school is largely local. Some observer pointed out to me even the difference in advertising and recruiting. A promotional brochure that is elaborate and sophisticated may serve a college well where it can be detrimental or appear inappropriate for recruiting at the high school level.

Additionally, one writer has stated that the Catholic secondary schols today reflect the pluralism of the Church itself. Some are more traditional, others are more humanistic, others communitarian and others more service-oriented. Often enough these types do not exist separately, but indeed, most schools demonstrate some of all four of these types with an accent on one or the other. No doubt the same could be said of the college. Beyond that, in the words of one observer, "if anything is clear it is that in the United States there is a real pluralism among Catholic colleges and universities in the way they perceive the Catholic identity."[21]

Opinion is interesting on the relations of the colleges and high schools in this last generation. Most to whom I spoke feel that the relations between the two levels have improved in this last decade as compared to the decade before. Often enough the comment was made that Catholic colleges and universities in the 1960s were going through a sort of second generation immigrant crisis, wanting very much to be like Harvard and Yale to get the right grants and in general to look and sound very academic. Thus visible association with Catholic elementary and secondary schools was not a congenial expectation. There was irony in the institutions distancing themselves from some Catholic establishments while Harvard's genial and brilliant sociologist David Reisman was urging them to be more Catholic, much like Robert Frost's advice to John Kennedy in those years, "Be more Irish than Harvard." Academic values dictated very much the hiring of non-Catholic professors, an issue raised as recently as January, 1986 by the Dean of the School of Philosophy at the Catholic University of America and the dean of Philosophy at the University of St. Thomas in Houston.[22] Futhermore, there was the matter of government aid with the Tilton case in 1971 finding, in the thought of Chief Justice Warren Burger, that these colleges were eligible because they could not be called "sectarian."

The question is Catholicity. The bishops of California

met with the local presidents in 1975 when other seminars were being held in various parts of the country on the same issue. The questions were pressing: how to be a link with the Church and the continuing Christian tradition and the ability to provide students with things for which the secular institutions are perhaps not well equipped, namely a strong sense of social justice and responsibility, an awareness of the spiritual dimensions of reality, the opportunity for worship and the systematic exploration in deepening of the life of faith.

The issue remains of the Catholic focus, nuance or context in which various disciplines are taught. This issue concerns the high school as well and it is brought up often enough in the question of whether economics taught in Catholic high schools will reflect the moral values from the bishops' pastoral letter to come.

There remains, too, the question of the liberal arts, mentioned in *Guadium et Spes* from the Second Vatican Council, a point made as a "traditional" concern. One of our local college administrators remarked that the liberal arts are related in our minds with theology because in our system much of what we consider as religious truths and values as well as so much of our western civilization is communicated and enriched through the liberal arts. This is the wisdom that survives amidst cultural shifts and was favorably seen as resurging in Catholic circles by John T. Noonan, Jr. of the University of California at Berkeley five years ago.

Finances remain the most serious problem, facing Catholic educators since the earliest days of the 19th century. It is a difficulty that the Catholic college and university has to contend with, namely, not to be economically elite.

The education of older adults is another growing concern, particularly in the light of the adult education focus of the Church in recent years. There are vocational concerns as well.

There remains much more to do on the relation to the Catholic high school.

With regard to questions with which the high schools have to deal, they may have faced more sharply than the college and university the question of what it means to be Catholic and worthwhile at a given time and in a given set of circumstances, precisely because their existence had been and is so precarious. They are strongly supported in the Catholic community. Father Andrew Greeley has made the point in a number of ways, indicating that unavailability of new schools in the suburban

areas is the primary reason for the decline in Catholic school attendance at the high school level. In the 1974 National Opinion Research Center survey item that indicated Catholic schools have outlived their usefulness and are no longer needed in modern day life, only 10 percent of the respondents endorsed the statement. Sixty-five percent rejected it strongly and another 24 percent rejected it "somewhat." Father Greeley, of course, lays heavy blame at the feet of the hierarchy who will do to the schools exactly what the nativists have wanted to do for a long time.[23]

In my discussions with high school people they evidenced a security within themselves and a clarity of direction that comes from the Second Vatican Council, from the documents of the American Bishops and from their own experience. They have a common awareness that they must share resources. The superintendents are to bring the principals together in dialogue within the diocese on practical matters but also on Catholic issues, particularly those related to theological questions. Each high school is to form its own identity.

As in the past, with the variance of language groups supporting Catholic education, so today there seems a strong desire to examine the attendance and non-attendance of ethnic groups in our schools.

As to the problem of finances that Archbishop John Ireland in the last century looked to public school participation as a solution, the schools together wish to look for their continued suport, particularly by way of the process of development. They also raised questions, however, about competition for teachers. They asked, too, from whom they should take money and what tactics should be used in acquiring finances so that values are not compromised.

A consequence may be the pursuit of more financially able students and the subsequent limitation of education for non-college people. This provides a great malaise within the diocesan system lest there be different classes of schools. It raises the major issue, however, of serving the poor, and for us, the ethnic minorities.

From the colleges, the high schools would hope that Catholic institutions will train Catholic teachers. They would like also to see classes provided for their own teachers by way of continuing education, and at a discount. They would look for summer seminars as well. They would like the expertise that departments of Catholic colleges and universities can offer them, particularly from such talents as professors of economics

to aid them with their own financial problems.

At their own level they must examine their support of Catholic colleges and their commitment to the continuing education of their students in the richness of the Catholic tradition.

Early in this paper, I quoted a simple statement that the mission of Catholic education is the mission of the Church. This dialogue being promoted is a good one. It gives time to realize how much has been accomplished in American Catholic education and yet it opens up the questions that must be faced for the guarantee of the future.

A relevant quotation comes from the close of Jay Dolan's book on the American Catholic experience, "A new spirit is alive in American Catholicism and the twenty-first century belongs to it. The challenge of the future still remains the timeless question that people have wrestled with for 200 years: how to be both Catholic and American. How the new generation of Catholics solve this riddle will determine the shape that American Catholicism will take in the years ahead."[24]

So, too, for American Catholic education.

ENDNOTES

1. G. Emmett Carter, "Introduction" to *Gravissimum Educationis*, in *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. by Walter M. Abbott (New York: America Press, 1966), p. 634.

2. *Gravissimum Educationis*, no 2.

3. Ibid., no. 3.

4. Ibid., no 8.

5. Ibid., no. 9.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid., no. 12.

9. J.F. Meyers, "Catholic Schools," in *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*, XVI, p. 63.

10. National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *To Teach as Jesus Did* (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1973,) par. 64.

11. Ibid., par. 80.

12. National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Catholic Higher Education and the Pastoral Mission of the Church* in *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, ed. by Hugh J. Nolan (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1984), par. 1.

13. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., "Letter to U.S. Bishops," July 24, 1981, p. 10.

14. E.C. Ryan, "Catholic Colleges and Universities," *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*, XVII, p. 252.

15. J.F. Murphy, "Higher Education, Church and," *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*, XVII, p. 252.

16. *Catholic Higher Education and the Pastoral Mission of the Church*, par. 34.

17. Jay P. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1985, p. 276.

19. Meyers, "Catholic Schools," p. 63.

20. J.D. Olsen, "Secondary Education, Catholic," *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*, XVII, p. 601.

21. Murphy, "Higher Education, Church and," p. 253.

22. Jude P. Dougherty and Leonard A. Kennedy, "The Future of Catholic Education," *Catholicism in Crisis*, IV (January, 1986, p. 22ff.

23. Andrew Greeley, *The American Catholic* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1977), p. 185.

24. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, p. 454.

CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES: RENEWING THE VISION

Michael J. Guerra
Executive Director, Secondary Schools Department
National Catholic Educational Association

Preamble

The time has come, the walrus said,
To speak of many things....

--Lewis Carroll
"The Walrus and the Carpenter"

As I begin this task, there is a nagging doubt that nibbles at my ordinarily unnibbled confidence. The theme of our symposium is collaboration, the methodology is conversation, but my assignment is to produce a monologue. How then does the monologue contribute to collaboration and conversation? It is simply this: that someone must begin.

No, I am not Prince Hamlet, nor was meant to be;
Am an attendant lord, one that will do
To swell a progress, start a scene or two...

--T.S. Eliot
"The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock"

My vision would have us all sitting, carefully if not altogether comfortably, on a three-legged stool. The legs are different in heft (as we are ourselves) and so they contribute different degrees of support, but each one is important. The three proposed pillars are curriculum content, institutional accountability and service to the Church. There are surely other ways to sort out common concerns and to shape future conversations. It can be argued that our students would serve nicely as a fourth leg, offering welcome stability and essential support for our discussions, as they do for our institutions. Many Catholic high school students do go on to Catholic colleges, but most do not. Nevertheless, there are substantial similarities in our alumni lists, and there is obviously ample room for exploring ways in which we can strengthen the coherence and continuity of our

educational efforts. So, with introductions completed, let us get on with the conversation.

Content: A Question of Definition

Go and catch a falling star
Get with child a mandrake root,
Tell me where all past years are,
Or who cleft the devil's foot;
Teach me to hear mermaids singing,
And find
What wind
Serves to advance an honest mind.

--John Donne
"Song"

Ernest Boyer describes the relationship between American colleges and schools as a chasm in need of a bridge.

> Today, with all the talk about educational excellence, schools and colleges still live in two separate worlds. Presidents and deans rarely talk to principals and superintendents. College faculty do not meet with their counterparts in ... schools, and curriculum reforms at every level are planned in isolation. It's such a simple point -- the need for close collaboration -- and yet it is a priority that has been consistently ignored.[1]

Boyer's definition of the common agenda for colleges and schools serves as a useful beginning for our own conversations. He raises several questions which he suggests college and school leaders need to address together. The first (also at or near the top of William Bennett's agenda) is the question of curriculum content. Powerful forces within the educational reform movement are urging a return to an emphasis on the basic disciplines -- science, literature, language, history, mathematics. State legislatures and governors have raised high school graduation requirements in more than one-third of the states, and concurrently many state and private universities have raised their own admissions standards. With the exception of a few states where non-academic mandates may threaten the Catholic high school's freedom to develop and maintain curricula appropriate to their

religious identity and the communities they serve, Catholic educators have been largely uninvolved in discussions about academic content. Our Catholic high schools have always had relatively high academic expectations for their students and relatively good academic results. With the notable exception of the Exemplary School Recognition Program, we have been content generally to go on about our business, supported by a small but growing research literature that seems to demonstrate that we are successful educators because students learn more in our schools than they would elsewhere.

Still, what have they learned? What should they learn? What does it mean to be an educated person? What does it mean to be an educated Catholic?

Does a four-year high school English requirement necessarily include four Shakespearean plays, the *Merchant of Venice*, *Julius Ceasar*, *Othello*, and *Hamlet*, in that order? A smattering of Milton, a bit of Donne? *The Sun Also Rises*, *Moby Dick*, *Crime and Punishment*? Should there be a special place for Christian literature -- for Hopkins, Greene, Percy? And how well should a graduate be able to write?

Does a three- or four-year History (or is it Social Studies?) requirement include non-Western history as well as European and U.S. History? And how do we teach our history as Church, our glories and our troubles, our roles as victims and as persecutors, our creations and our conservations, our eloquence and our silence, our times of light and of darkness, of windows open and shutters drawn?

These are just a few of the many questions about the stuff of schooling, the raw materials of education. I would not argue that these not quite randomly chosen examples are necessarily the most urgent, but they serve to remind us that content questions are not resolved by establishing credit requirements for graduation or admission. As Catholic educators, we should play an active and important role in defining the content of American education. We can enrich the conversation not only with our own professional gifts but also with the educational tradition of the Church, a legacy we carry in our spiritual genes. But there is little likelihood that we will find our way into the national dialogue unless we begin the conversation within our own community. It may be inevitable and appropriate that a few Hesburghs are occasionally invited to join the Boks and Boyers in sylvan retreat to ponder and pronounce, but most of us will learn first and best from one another, and we will choose our own spokespersons to represent us -- once we begin the

conversation.

Autonomy, Accountability and Accreditation: A Question of Value

I, too, dislike it: there are things that are important
beyond all this fiddle.
Reading it, however, with a perfect contempt for it, one
discovers in
it, after all, a place for the genuine.

--Marianne Moore
"Poetry"

Boyer suggests that our common agenda should also include a shared concern for evaluation.

> School and College leaders should be looking for better ways to evaluate students ... (We) want local control, (but) we also want a yardstick to measure national results ... In all the reports about the quality of education, testing and evaluation have been shockingly ignored.
>
> The SAT may be a helpful instrument in predicting student performance in college, but it is not a report card on the nation's schools. The time has come to build a closer correlation between what we teach and what we test. This is an educational challenge schools and colleges should confront together.[2]

The issue of testing and evaluating students is perhaps the most visible and comprehensible element of institutional accountability, but we know that accountability, like love, is a many-splendored thing. Like love, institutional accountability incorporates unspecified measures of selflessness and self-interest in attempting to balance public service and public trust with institutional autonomy. The balance is particularly complex and delicate for private church-related institutions. Our freedoms to define our own mission and to select the community we want to serve as well as the programmatic means to serve that community are conditioned by our responsibilities to the church, to the society at large and to the profession. We tend to

assume, correctly in my view, that it is precisely in the way we respond to these diverse expectations, fulfilling some while challenging others, that we contribute to the synthesis of faith and culture. Still, 'tis no simple task, and the game is often played without referees, and in many instances with indistinct boundaries.

David O'Brien speaks eloquently about the power of Catholic education; (Dr. O'Brien tends to concentrate on the Catholic college to the exlusion of the Catholic high school, but I will presume permission to extend his analysis to include the high schools):

> The Church needs its colleges (and secondary schools). Their specific function is to educate students who will synthesize faith and knowledge and become agents of reform, particularly by making a fundamental option for the poor and for peace.[3]

O'Brien argues in favor of what I would characterize as the radical middle position, a kind of constructive engagement halfway between withdrawal from a world perceived as hopelessly sinful and acceptance and assimilation within a world perceived as inevitable if not benign. O'Brien's argument seems eminently sensible, although his own benign tolerance offers essentially the same smiles for Merton and Berrigan on the one side and for Novak and Greeley on the other, making O'Brien perhaps the most catholic of American Catholic intellectuals.

But the basic questions are not resolved by rejecting the extremes of non-involvement in favor of constructive engagement. How do we measure the effectiveness of our institutions? Given the extent of our institutional autonomy, to whom do we hold ourselves accountable, and how do we structure the evaluation process? Who develops the criteria, and who applies them once they are established?

Voluntary accreditation has been the generally accepted way in which colleges and secondary schools have held themselves accountable to the profession, and presumably to the larger community. Glen Dumke, writing in *Education on Trial: Strategies for the Future*, suggests that voluntary accreditation falls so far short of providing appropriate accountability that it could lead to a radical increase in governmental control.

> If the present enthusiasm for reform in education is to bear permanent fruit, some attention must be

paid to the accreditation process, which is not, at present, doing the job it should be doing....

One of the chief problems of accreditation is the manner in which it has defined itself. In the regionals an institution is deemed to be accredited if it lives up to its own statement of mission and purpose. This presents a serious problem, because many weaker institutions have statements of mission and purpose that are, to put it mildly, so loose as to be worthless....

If the process is to survive, therefore, and if the rapid advance of government in the process of educational evaluation is to halted, steps must be taken to restore accreditation to the role it is assumed to have--that of evaluating educational institutions, honestly, rigorously, and openly, so that when a person obtains a degree from an accredited institution, reality will match expectation.[4]

While Dumke's analysis examines the implications of evaluation, accreditation and reform for colleges and universities, the fundamental issues are the same for secondary schools. In a presentation at the annual meeting of the Middle States Association last year, I described the history of Catholic secondary school involvement with regional accreditation in generally positive terms, but I raised some concerns about the future:

...given a choice between school improvement driven by legislation and school improvement rooted in regional accreditation, I am confident most of us in Catholic education would choose the latter. But do we face such a choice? Is it not possible that state involvement in educational reform is a reflection of a popular conviction that, left to its own procedures, the profession cannot or will not improve the educational enterprise? And is that not to say that the public perception of regional evaluation and accreditation may not be altogether positive, since regional evaluations are clearly the profession's own procedures?

Whatever the current level of public confidence (or indeed public awareness) of the regional accrediting associations and their evaluation programs, regional associations remain a potentially powerful force for improving education and, perhaps equally important, for improving public perception and confidence in education. The major challenge we face is to make our evaluation efforts not only more sensitive to a particular member institution but also to the community it serves. I suspect we have not been particularly successful in meeting legitimate expectations for accountability to the community, but we need to work at it. What are the alternatives? I see only three:

To concede full responsibility to the state--God (Separationists should pardon the expression) forbid!

To offer each school complete and unlimited autonomy--if you are a disciple of Saint Milton of Friedman or you believe all educational administrators are potential philosopher kings and queens of the Platonic variety, perhaps...

To establish new accrediting associations of like-minded institutions--some independent schools have moved in that direction, and other groups within private education have considered expanding their associations to include an accrediting function. I regard movement in that direction as regrettable, because I believe public and private educators have much we can learn from one another, and we can collaborate without compromising our uniqueness. Still, as a last resort (like an increase in taxes), if there is no better way to earn the confidence of the public and the benign neglect of the state...[5]

So, in my view, Catholic colleges and secondary schools are challenged either to adapt and revive existing structures, or to develop new ways to hold themselves accountable to those

whom they serve. Given our historical relationships within the regional associations and a bias in favor of O'Brien's argument for constructive engagement with the larger educational community, it would seem wiser for us to strengthen our commitments to the existing associations rather than to withdraw our wagons and form smaller and exclusively Catholic circles. Our continued membership within the associations should not preclude the development of special relationships among our own institutions. We can be especially helpful to one another in the development of honest, clear and defensible mission statements that honor both our religious purpose and our public trust. This is not to deny that the mission statements of institutions will vary both within and between the sectors. But if, as Dumke suggests, the reform of the voluntary accreditation process rests on a more careful and critical scrutiny of an institution's mission statement, then Catholic educators should take on a major, although not exclusive, responsibility for the critique of Catholic institutions. There is important work for us here, and we can collaborate without compromising important institutional and sector distinctions.

Service to the Church: A Question of Family

> For we were nursed upon the selfsame hill,
> Fed the same flock, by fountain, shade and rill;
> Together both, ere the high lawns appeared
> Under the opening eyelids of the Morn,
> We drove afield, and both together heard
> What time the gray-fly winds her sultry horn,
> Battening our flocks with the fresh dews of night,
> Oft till the star that rose at evening, bright,
> Toward heaven's descent had sloped his westering wheel.
>
> --John Milton
> "Lycidas"

While an agenda for collaboration that examines issues of curriculum content and institutional accountability can and should be rooted in our shared religious identity, our conversations about these issues will be set in a broader professional context. Ultimately if not initially, our discussions will be extended to include our professional colleagues in education. But when we consider our relationship to the Church, we touch what for us must be the heart of the matter. It is precisely as Catholic

educators that we come together; it is our relationship to the Church that should draw us together in ways that transcend our shared professionalism. And yet it is here that strains and tensions become most obvious. Although I want to maintain a balanced view of the contributions of the two sectors to our common history, I believe it is fair to say that Catholic colleges began their discussions about the meaning of their Catholicity well before the secondary schools. *The Renewal of Catholic Higher Education* was published in 1968 as the culmination of a lengthy national consultation. One of the principal recommendations of the report addressed the identity issue directly:

> Each Catholic college or university should operationally interpret its "Catholicity." Specifically, the interpretation of "Catholic" should enable the institution to resolve problems such as the following:
>
> a) composition of board membership
> b) choice of administrators and tone of administration
> c) policies and procedures regarding selection and retention of faculty
> d) faculty involvement in institutional decision-making and in policy formation
> e) intellectual, socio economic, religious, and ethnic composition of the student body
> f) sources and percentage of capital and operational income
> g) curricular program(s)
> h) cocurricular and extracurricular program(s)
> i) student personnel policies
>
> This recommendation is implicit in the fact that institutional definitions in Catholic higher eductaion are frequently either vague or poorly communicated.[6]

Lest we assume that the identity issue was resolved sometime during the past twenty years, here is David O'Brien's summary of the *status quaestionis* c. 1985:

> The documents of the 1950's and 1960's, even the

most formal, give evidence of a struggle, ultimately successful, to establish the autonomy of the university from direct ecclesiastical control. Then the universities and colleges seemed determined to stand on their own ground, vindicate academic freedom, and, like so many ordinary Catholics, claim the right to decide for themselves the terms of their new relationship with the church. For the rest of us Andrew Greeley calls it "do it yourself Catholicism," a term, I think, that could adequately describe what the "Catholic" in Catholic higher education had tended to become. Yet here as elsewhere, it has turned out to be more complicated than we had expected, evident in that feeling you get in the corridor, but evident as well in the concern in this organization, and in so many schools in recent years, with questions of mission, purpose and Catholicity...

Most of our schools remain deeply rooted in the Catholic community, which supplies most of our students and gives us a sense of distinctiveness, however difficult we find it to define. Many remain under some kind of sponsorship by religious communities, which themselves have undergone renewal and arrived at some new, if troubled, understanding of themselves in service to the church and its mission. Those members who work within or have responsibility for the colleges and universities they sponsor, undoubtedly feel a personal need to convince themselves that there is some relationship between the mission of their religious community and the goals of their institution. Sometimes the question is posed directly and in a very challenging fashion by superiors or colleagues at work in other ministries, as is so often the case with the Jesuits, many of whom work in jeopardy in embattled parts of the globe. Sometimes alumni, parents or even students have expectations about the work that we do and ask questions which challenge our Catholicity; our answers are not all that clear, our minds not all that sure.

> If the internal need for integrity were not enough, there is the voice of the organized Church, calling us to some kind of account, as in the new Code of Canon Law and those troublesome documents from Rome, or inviting us to share in the work of the church, as in the bishops' recent pastoral letters, including one on higher education. At least within the American church, I sense that the desire of a generation ago for liberation from confining restrictions for the sake of authentic academic growth has been met; now there is a felt need to clarify Catholic identity, and a genuine willingness to respond to the invitation to collboration issued by the bishops. But there is a genuine confusion about how to respond, and even about what, after all, this word "Catholic" means.[7]

This is not to say that Catholic secondary schools did not develop their own identity crises, fueled by the Supreme Court decisions of the early seventies, which you may recall dropped an iron curtain between high schools described by the Court as serving impressionable youth in a pervasively religious atmosphere, and colleges that were, in the Court's analysis, either uninvolved in religious formation or unlikely to sway their adult clientele. While most Catholic educators were depressed because the *Lemon*[8] and *Meek*[9] decisions seemed to imply that fiscal fragility was likely to prove a terminal disease for many fine institutions, many were also troubled by the possibility tht the court's analysis of the high schools was not only unfair but inaccurate in its description of their palpably religious spirit. We argued then, as we argue now, that our schools serve a patently public and secular purpose as well as a religious purpose, that the outcomes and the sources of these diverse outcomes can be defined and distinguished, and that the public and secular services provided by our Catholic schools can place a legitimate claim on public support. But in the process, some of us discovered it was easier to find evidence of our public service than our religious identity. We set to work on the question, aided in large measure by an influential pastoral letter on Catholic education, *To Teach as Jesus Did*.[10] Shortly after the publication of the pastoral, NCEA launched a major national effort to identify and strengthen the religious identity of the Catholic school. The initial project, "Giving Form to the Vision," has been followed by a series of efforts, including the current

"Vision and Values" and "Shepherds" projects.

In my view, there is little to be gained by attempting to compare the relative Catholicity of the two sectors. My own exprience convinces me that the leadership in both sectors is committed to a continuing conversation about the meaning of religious identity; that conversation has been going on in separate rooms for years, but we have a welcome and perhaps unprecedented opportunity to bring at least some significant portion of the discussion into a common forum. I suggest that we begin by appropriating Mario's Metaphor of the Family.

We are of course part of many larger families, the human family, the Christian family, but we are also a very special family, the family of Christian educators. We have different roles and different places at the table, but we are all called to the same table -- to share our strengths and our needs -- in communion, and in conversation. It would be a great mistake to underestimate the importance of conversation.

Conversation is the prerequisite for collaboration, and it is presumably what educators do best. Again, in David O'Brien's words:

> In the end, the ability of Christian (education) to make a substantial contribution...depends on the ability of its Christian participants to undertake the difficult work of...**initiating and sustaining conversation**...The problems of our schools will not be solved unless people are able to talk together. Conversation will not solve the problems, but they will surely not be solved in the absence of conversation.[11]

It would be naive to assume that conversation requires no more than time and place and willing participants. Conversation requires a common language, and it is here that we confront the real costs of our recent history of separation and autonomy. Within each sector it is hardly a simple matter to initiate and sustain conversations between specialized departments, between faculty and administration, between lay and religious, between Catholic and non-Catholic, between school and community; to bring the sectors together will require patience and persistence as we rebuild a common vocabulary. But that is precisely what families do best. They bridge the gaps of age and education because they are fundamentally committed to one another.The best of families are blessed with the gift of indefectability -- the

prodigal will always be welcomed with a celebration and the faithful will not forfeit their place.

It was easier of course when we had powerful common enemies, because then we had no alternative to the family that was church. Persecution may be a gift when a community is young and relatively weak, but Catholic education is no longer isolated and threatened. In many important respects, we are models for others. We welcome our acceptance, but we must resist assimilation. We need to remain faithful to the family. We will always have things to teach one another. To be sure, Catholic colleges have scholarly resources that are not ordinarily found in Catholic secondary schools, but Catholic secondary schools have their own gifts to bring to the conversation. We have a shared commitment to serve the poor. The successful expriences of our high schools can be particularly helpful to our colleges, especially in expanding educational opportunities for Hispanics. Recent research confirms the fact that Catholic high schools are clearly effective in raising the academic achievement levels of low income students, and within that group our schools are most successful with Hispanic students.[12] How can we share that success? How can we build on it? We begin with conversation.

We have commitments not only to those we presently serve, but also to the future. Those in leadership positions today hav unprecedented responsibilities to identify, encourage and train their successors. From virtually any set of initial assumptions, American Catholic education's future will depend on new leadership developed in new ways. We would be fools to undervalue the continuing importance of religious communities, but their contributions will come from the quality of their charism rather than the weight of their numbers. Catholic education obviously will draw increasingly on lay leadership. Who will find them? Who will train them? Who will support them, not only with dollars but with true colleagueship, with friendship? How will they become part of our family? This is a task to be shared. If we go our separate ways, some of our institutions will succumb to the temptation to choose leadership with a vision of the future that that is rooted in a superficial appreciation of our traditions, leaders whose commitments are exclusively professional, who offer head and hands but not heart. While most of our institutions have modest portfolios, we are richly endowed with competent and committed people, especially when we come together. And as we find new ways to share the wealth that comes from our common memory and our com-

mon faith, our endowment will increase.

Like every family, we are not without our differences. We have had some notable and perhaps overly public disagreements about some public policy questions. The legacy of *Lemon et al.* is perhaps too much with us. I know of few leaders in Catholic higher education who have taken strong public positions on government support for parental choice in precollegiate education; I am also unaware of colleagues from my branch of the family who have spoken out against cuts in college student grants and loans. Our needs are different, but our potential for effective and mutually supportive public policy initiatives offers us important opportunities for collaboration--after we make a genuine commitment to initiating and sustaining the conversation.

The prospects for our conversation are particularly promising at this moment in our history. In many ways, the National Catholic Educational Association offers more than a forum; it provides us with a table. While each of us has a place at the table and a place in the conversation, it is interesting and encouraging to hear support for our efforts from the head of the table, Sr. Catherine McNamee, NCEA's president-elect.

> ...diversity has always involved a number of partnerships--between clergy and lay persons, different religious orders, men and women, parents and parishes, public and private sectors. These relationships provide a solid foundation on which we can build as we develop the more extensive and more complex partnerships which will be needed if Catholic education is to realize its full potential during the years ahead.
>
> As the major national association that encompasses this vast array of institutions, programs and constituencies, NCEA is in a unique position to play a significant leadership role in strengthening existing relationships and in promoting new and creative modes of collaboration. Our constant quest for quality will continue to involve us in collaborative research projects with the Ford Foundation, the Knights of Columbus, the NCCB, the NEH, the USCC....Curriculum development will be greatly enriched by new partnerships between Catholic schools and colleges, between

public and private education, between American institutions and Catholic schools throughout the rest of the world....If current trends continue, of course, it seems probable that schools and colleges under Catholic sponsorship in the decades to come will be essentially lay institutions. It is especially important, then, that in this period of transition religious sisters, brothers and priests be recognized for the enormous contributions they have made in creating an extraordinary mosaic of American Catholic education and that they be inspired with a sense of responsibility for strengthening their partnership with lay colleagues who share this mission with them today and who will carry it forward into the future.

Finally, there is the matter of financing our educational ventures...NCEA will continue to work for government aid in the form of tuition tax credits, financing aid to students, special services....These lobbying efforts will entail cooperation with a variety of groups such as USCC and NAICU. Partnerships with government itself will also persist and will break new ground. American Catholic education, if it struggles courageously, will make a major new contribution to the world's understanding of church-state relations.

Forming these partnerships will not be easy. Leadership for this challenge is a prime responsibility of NCEA. The Catholic educational "system" of which we can all be proud in the 1990s will have a wide diversity of institutions which represent true responsiveness to the contemporary world in which we live: a growing commitment to collaboration, nationally and internationally; the presence of many excellent elementary and secondary schools as well as a number of fine colleges and a few outstanding research universities; and a wide network of religious education programs serving people of all ages.[13]

ENDNOTES

1. Boyer, Ernest, "The Need for School-College Collaboration," *Higher Education and National Affairs*, Volume 16, Number 11 (September 2, 1985).

2. Ibid.

3. O'Brien, David J., " Partnership in a New Key," *Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education*, Volume 6, Number 1 (Washington, DC: Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, Summer, 1985), pp. 3-4.

4. Dumke, G., "A Ministry of Education for the United States? The Problem of Accreditation," *Education On Trial: Strategies for the Future*, (San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies, 1985), pp. 259, 273.

5. Guerra, Michael G., "Evaluation, Accreditation and Reform," *NCEA Notes*, Volume 4, Number 2 (March, 1985).

6. Ford, C.E. and Roy, E.L., *The Renewal of Catholic Higher Education.* (Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association, 1968), pp. 29-30.

7. O'Brien, op. cit., pp. 3-4.

8. *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 403 U.S. 602 (1971).

9. *Meek v. Pittenger*, 421 U.S. 349, 354 (1975).

10. National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *To Teach as Jesus Did* (Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1973).

11. O'Brien, op. cit., p. 9.

12. Benson, P.L.; Yeager, R.J.; Wood, P.K.; Guerra, M.J.; and Manno, B.V., *Catholic High Schools: Their Impact on Low-Income Students* (Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association, 1986).

13. McNamee, Catherine, C.S.J., Statement to the Board of Directors of the National Catholic Educational Association, November, 1985).

LEADERSHIP: TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY STYLE

Mary D. Griffin
and
Christine Fritz
Sr. Marla Loehr, S.N.D.
Rev. August Rakoczy
Boston College

Leadership, like fashion, emerges with something new as each decade passes. A close look at each, however, gives evidence that the basics remain.

Those of us who have studied leadership in administration or management courses saw the leader at one time as the key person in scientific management or as the human relations expert with high regard for people in the organization. We were able at another time to identify all the traits that made for sound leadership. Case studies highlighted the open system which enhanced communication, reporting, followership and decision-making. Basic to leadership were good judgment and a climate of trust.

In addition to the dimensions of judgment and trust, which are all-important, leadership in the twenty-first century will demand more risk-taking, management skills and initiative. The new leadership calls for power, but power could destroy the vision of those who have it unless humility is allowed to dictate that power is a temporary gift to be used while one directs the process of change.

Leadership has an air of mystery about it. One is able to identify it, but unable to describe it. Usually one observes behavior and is aware of resources being used for some good. Such resources include people, money, time and, for many, space.

The real leader constantly sends out signals of commitment and concern by attending functions, participating in public events, especially where one's presence is valued highly. Leadership has always had its burdens which demand stamina and time.

The purpose of this paper is to deal in a specific way with leadership in Catholic education at the secondary and collegiate levels. Sergiovanni[1] talks about two kinds of essential leadership that have implication for the administrator of a Catholic institution: **tactical** leadership involves analysis which leads to administrative action and means of minor magnitude,

which are of small scale and which serve larger purposes; strategic leadership is the art and science of enlisting support for broader policies and purposes and for devising longer-range plans. If administration is to be of quality, attention must be given to both kinds of leadership. If one relies on the tactical only, a daily efficiency may be apparent, but excellence may very well be absent.

Cultural expression is a new variable which is emerging in leadership. It should be viewed as an important resource to the school or college. If one recognizes leadership as a function or organizational characteristics and group dynamics, one will see the importance of all segments of the school or college participating in the dynamics of leadership. The wise administrator will promote such participation, support activities, and help to develop skills of all concerned. Organizational culture influences effectiveness, although there is a danger which could hamper an administrator form recognizing it, and that is the preoccupation with daily management.

Another real value of leadership rests with the meanings one's actions impart to others. Again, Sergiovanni hints at the importance of culture, "....complete rendering of leadership requires that we move beyond the obvious to the subtle, beyond th immediate to the long-range, beyond actions to meanings, beyond viewing organizations and groups within social systems to cultural entities."

What the Catholic school administrator stands for is more important than what he or she does; he or she communiates a meaning to others which is more important than style. Leadership acts, however, express culture in that they intend to construct harmony and order within the institution while focusing attention on the purpose of the school/college, its history, tradition and customs. The latter portray life within the institution and offer the opportunity to socialize members and gain their confidence.

A clarion call is being made to those of us in Catholic education to take another look at collaboration between secondary schools and institutions of higher learning. First of all we must ask ourselves if there is encouragement for such action. Bennis puts it well when he states "....even when we begin to identify leadership issues, build new strengths in the process, we must decide on whether current organizational structures encourage the development of such collaboration."[2] In a recent pastoral letter, the Catholic bishops stress, "....today a greater spirit of partnership and teamwork is needed; competition alone

will not do the job. Only a renewed commitment by all to the common good can deal creatively with the realities of interdependence....each makes a contribution to the enterprise and each has a stake in its growth or decline....."[3]

If we believe that Catholic education is the formation of young people, then administrators and faculty in the high schools and colleges have something in common. They share, too, the purpose of education, man's ultimate end and the means to achieve it, Christian faith and the strength of sacramental bonds. Our public or private counterparts are not so fortunate.

Many years ago, secondary and college students were under one roof. As is the case with progress, or bigness setting in, high schools and colleges became separate entities. Once they parted, new identities, missions, objectives and philosophies emerged which have militated against collaboration, at least in the recent past.

Coming from different directions can cause uneasiness and often, distrust. Tensions are not always recognized. It serves no purpose to try to analyze any failures or to assess blame, but it does make sense to realize that conflicts are normal, natural and often necessary.

Whenever there are two units, be they leader and faculty, faculty member and faculty members, group and group, or even leader and leader, situations in human settings arise when persons have diverse and sometimes divergent views on an issue. Usually these conflicts occur over rights, needs, power, and resources.

Viewing conflict from an historical perspective shows there has been an evolving understanding of the concept. Up to the late 1920s, conflicts were associated with troublemakers in the organization.[4]

Around the time of World War II, tension was equated with conflict and found to originate in experiences of socialization, structured conditions of modern industrial society, and frustrations of the workplace. Since human beings were genetically unable to cope with such conditions they looked to the social milieu for release. Unfortunately, inadequate mechanisms for conflict release were found. Conflict became a by-product of the interactive processes of the social system associated with various social structures and not with historical factors. There is no intent here to distract one from leadershp in favor of a long treatise on conflict theories, but the resolution of conflict falls within the purview of leadership functions, or in common parlance, "goes with the turf."

Conflict resolution is the ability to handle conflicts between individuals or groups within an organization by diagnosing the conflict and selecting the strategies to achieve such resolution. Conflict resolution may be the employment of peacemaking skills, where the objective is to see that the conflict makes sense and that the parties involved do not become discouraged at what appears to be a meaningless situation. Conflict resolutions may also be seen as mediation between two parties.

Trust, mentioned early in this paper as basic to good leadership, is seen as critical in conflict resolution. It helps to build a positive and creative relationship over time.

Kahn[5] indicates that when seeking resolution of conflict within or between groups there are three strategies that parties tend to utilize. The first is making the system work. In other words, it is not the system that is wrong, but people. The second solution is to set up additional machinery to handle the problem. This generally involves the creation of new rules and regulations. Thus the conflict is controlled but not resolved. The third approach is to change the existing structure so there is less built-in conflict. This means attempting together to arrive at the causes of the problem. Kahn notes that most solutions that affect groups center on the first two possibilities while it is the third that will bring about the best and most lasting results. Again, the basis for the third solution is deep internal trust between the parties involved and honesty about the issues.

It is essential that a linking person (possibly the local ordinary or superintendent is our case) who is a member of each group "provide an information flow and establish reciprocal influence between the groups of which he is a member. This is an especially important role when the groups are engaged in problem solving."[6]

To make a collaborative of the kind we as Catholic educators envision operate, initiative on the part of bishops, administrators, faculty and students of the Catholic institutions in question, the superintendent or diocesan educational official and Catholic laity is needed. Each must recognize tht neither the high school nor college has a monopoly on education. Hands should be joined to develop a new collaborative -- a two-way-street collaborative with open communication, mutual trust, respect, commitment and determined perseverance. Again, crucial to the relationship is strong and visible support from the diocesan hierarchy.

Each institution is a powerful force, uniquely Catholic. If the two (high school and college) work together on common

needs or concerns such as fiscal management, facilities maintenance, fluctuating marketplace, technological changes, problems of aging faculties, salaries, and curriculum development that reflects societal needs (especially those of Hispanics) with proper identification and use of community representatives and linking personnel, a model collaborative could be created and implemented in many dioceses.

Financial demands are heavy now, and from recent economic indications will continue to be burdensome through the nineties. Creative ways must be found to get away from heavy reliance on tuition, to seek endowments, to offer diocesan scholarships to those high school graduates who want to teach and who promise years of service to the diocese upon graduation from college. Salary scales should be reviewed. There is nothing to be gained by many who stay in Catholic education today.

We need a radical approach to fiscal management. As Mark Twain said "Thunder is good; thunder is impressive; but it is lightning that does the work." Perhaps a first bolt as part of the approach is training in budget keeping and financial strategies for our administrators. Business associates can help or outside consultants can be employed for any necessary in-service or updating deemed important. A word of caution here, and that is, if a program of fiscal management and responsibility is set in motion, know something about the credentials of those hired to run the program.

Catholic school administrators must feel at ease with the language and procedures of budget justifications, cost analyses, and the concept of "the bottom line." If our high schools and colleges are not graduating a "good product" in a fiscally responsible way, the current interest in Catholic education could turn to disenchantment.

The future of funding for Catholic institutions could well include sound competition, tax credits, and vouchers; if such funding becomes a reality, it behooves us to be good managers of money because basic principles of sound fiscal responsibility have much relevance to the kind of educational programs offered.

Union regulations may have to be reviewed, but joint employment of a single custodial staff bears examination. Businessmen are familiar with the cost effectiveness of physical plant upkeep. They stand ready to be of assistance to us. There may be advantages to a single budget process for two institutions and a sharing of faculty as well as library personnel which might prove to be an exciting venture. Land holdings can be

assessed for possible leasing; a forum can be created for discussion of common issues; joint in-service programs can be initiated. Marketing and advertising can be explored as a single enterprise.

Retirement counseling for faculty in both institutions or all institutions in the diocese can afford opportunities for both lay and religious to discuss fears, anxieties, future plans and second careers for the next phase of their lives. Early retirement plans, where appropriate, should be as attractive and helpful as possible.

In a true partnership, one cannot be the taker and one the giver. Some colleges are not in a financial position to offer tuition remission to religious or lay teachers of Catholic high schools. Other ways to finance education of religious or lay administrators or teachers in Catholic universities must be sought. If not, the problem of dependency will remain; the quest for quality will diminish. Education is a business -- a business of the Church. Therefore, it is imperative that human resource investments, as well as capital investment be made.

Since Vatican II, Catholic institutions have placed additional emphasis on social and religious responsibilities towards students. The worth of the individual has been an overriding concern in all areas of a person's life. Today, with the large wave of immigration, administrators must lead in efforts toward cultural literacy. Familiarity with non-Western cultures is necessary before curriculum planning gets underway.

In urban areas across the country within the next two years, the majority of students in high schools will be minority. This sounds like a contradiction in terms -- the majority will be minority. The school/college administrator must go beyond awareness of other cultures in assisting faculty and students to become more responsive and sensitive to concerns and interests of minority students, especially Hispanic youngsters, and come closer to realizing the social value of a bilingual Church -- and America.

Catholic leaders should articulate the differences between Catholic education and that which is delivered by other private and public institutions. The nine or ten major reports for reform and the many accompanying documents that have been in our hands since 1984 indicate the need for fundamental changes. Many reports make special mention of how education in Catholic schools meets high standards, and such recognition should enhance this period of renaissance for Catholic schools.

We cannot settle back into complacency. We should

develop jointly a center to study educational reform and change within our institutions, and through research we should identify factors that can be used to restructure the system. There may be a way to revitalize community dedication to Catholic education by making facilities accessible for community or neighborhood functions. We should be involved politically to bring about positive change for education in general. This involvement includes lobbying, contact with state legislators, writing to inform the many publics. It requires, as Cunningham says: "....a certain toughness with regard to the task that must be done and a commitment to it."[7] He sees a major leadership responsibility in helping to bridge gaps between and among different interest groups by communicating and interacting with the many that have a stake in the operation of the school.

Many services can be provided through agencies in the community rather than through schools alone. Also, the growing need for training and retraining teachers, especially in areas which are in greatest need -- math and science -- can be met through cooperative relationships among colleges and universities, schools, and businesses.

Continuing education in updating skills and knowledge may be undertaken through some time-sharing arrangements with business and industry. All parties must be convinced of the worth of such efforts to make the commitment and give time to planning and implementation. When seeking cooperation, those involved in the collaborative must be assured that specific services sought are consistent with resources, mission, goals and objectives.

In all honesty, collaboration may be for some of us a means of survival. While there might be a sense of urgency, optimism should be evident as well because of possible consequences for students, faculty and administrators when groups that make up the collaborative are, as Maeroff says, "full partners in the process."[8] In Maeroff's report, several partnerships that are working effectively are sketched in terms of ongoing action. ADVANCE, the Syracuse University Project enables high school students to enroll in university courses while remaining in their high school classes. Selected high school teachers are employed by the University to teach specific courses. Seventy-five secondary schools in four states are participating in the project. In another partnership, eighty of New Haven's high school teachers study with senior faculty at the University. In a Connecticut survey, close to half the teachers who participated in the project indicated that the program

motivated them to remain as a teacher in the city.

An example of experimental transition schools is a Matteo Ricci College cooperatively planned by the Seattle Preparatory School and Seattle University. Resources were combined and two institutions created a school in which selected grammar school graduates enroll in a six-year program resulting in high school and college degrees being awarded.

Because minority students are often prepared inadequately to succeed in freshman college classes, transition programs for disadvantaged students have been developed by the City College of the City University of New York and also by the University of Alabama. The focus is on secondary students as early as the ninth grade.

Maeroff concludes his report by insisting that "the jurisdictional boundaries separating school and colleges are crossed successfully only when institutions on both sides of the line are amenable." Claiming that it is the responsibility of higher education to initiate the collaborations, Maeroff urged colleges and universities to take the first steps while highly cognizant of five key principles: realization of a common set of goals; building on a genuine spirit of cooperation; maintaining sharp focus on one or two specific goals; providing for appropriate rewards; and looking beyond the bureaucratic logistics to action stratgies. While we do not have to agree that the college or university must be the one to always take the initiative, Maeroff's report has broad implications for Catholic institutions of higher learning as well as for secondary schools. The few examples of collaborative efforts cited are not necessarily here to be replicated, but have been highlighted to generate ideas on the forming of new partnerships.

One aspect of leadership that has not yet been touched upon in this paper is the necessity for rewards, be they stipends, titles, recognition of some sort for efforts/accomplishments. A pat on the back is needed by everyone from time to time. The leader who is conscious of the "people" dimension of the organization while at the same time cognizant of the normative dimension, is both effective and efficient.

Several key assumptions have undergirded the topic of leadership in this paper. One major assumption has been that the leader must want to lead and give evidence of being in control while using power afforded to the role. Another assumption is that behind partnerships are beliefs that improvements can be made. A third fundamental assumption is that of accountability. When one pays for a service, he should receive the best -- and, at

a fair price. This is a very limited discussion of accountability, but should suffice for purposes here.

For those of us in the profession of education, evaluation of our work becomes a method of collectively scoring ourselves. The performance of such is an ingredient of leadership and professionalism. Implied is that we are critics as well as creators. The latter prompts us to be concerned with making rational responses to changing conditions around us. Change is inevitable, but when we plan for it we provide evolutionary rather than revolutionary steps to meet it.

The concept of leadership encompasses efforts to change attitudes, correct deficiencies, and affect legislation. Ethics fits into the professional accountability picture because society places trust in a particular profession and expects it to deal with the rightness and wrongness of actions in the light of our views of man as a human being.

Each Catholic school administrator is responsible for good teaching, for impartiality, for an unbiased assessment of accomplishments and for the exercise of freedom of expression in the classroom. The stronger the leader, the better the professional climate, so necessary for the leader to be an efficient catalyst for change while using the relationship of faith to all aspects of life within and outside the institution.

The immediate task ahead is to develop the art of looking to the future. The time is here to plan and make recommendations for visible, enviable leadership in Catholic education. We can do it.

ENDNOTES

1. Sergiovanni, Thomas J., "Cultural and Competing Perspectives in Administration Theory and Practice," in *Perspectives in Leader Effectiveness*, Paul Hersey and John Stenton, (Eds.) (Center for Leadership Studies: Ohio University Press, 1980.

2. Bennis, Warren, "Where Have All the Leaders Gone?" in *Contemporary Issues in Leadership*, William E. Rosenbach and Robert L. Taylor (Eds.) (Boulder: Westview Press, Inc., 1984.

3. National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy* (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1985).

4. Himes, J.S., *Conflict and Conflict Management* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980).

5. Kahn, R.L., *Power and Conflict in Organizations* (New York: Basic Books, 1964).

6. Likert, R. and Likert, J.G., *New Ways of Managing Conflict* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976).

7. Cunningham, Luverne, "Leaders and Leadership: 1985 and Beyond," *Kappan*, September, 1985.

8. Maeroff, Gene I. *Partnerships in Education* (Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1983).

ADDITIONAL SOURCES

Anrig, Gregory, R. "Schools and Higher Education in a Period of Reform: Strengthening Standards and Performance," Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the AAEC, Chicago, March 15, 1984.

Astin, Alexander. *Achieving Educational Excellence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Bennett, D.H. "Making a Partnership Work," *Nations Business* 72, 1984.

Boyer, Ernest L. *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America*, New York: Harper and Row, 1983.

Doyle, Peter and Brisson, Candice. *Partners in Growth: Business -- Higher Education*, Northeast-Midwest Institute, Economics Development Series, 1985.

Hersey, Paul and Stenton, John , Eds., *Perspectives in Leader Effectiveness*, The Center for Leadership Studies: Ohio University Press, 1980.

Hodgkinson, H.L. *Institutions in Transition*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1971.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.

Peters, Thomas J., and Waterman, Robert H., Jr. *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies*, New York: Harper and Row, 1982.

Rosenbach, Wm. E. and Taylor, Robert L., Eds., *Contemporary Issues in Leadership*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1984.

CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES: PARTNERSHIP IN A CONTINUOUS CURRICULUM

Sister Mary Peter Traviss, O. P.
Associate Professor
University of San Francisco

Not since Robert Maynard Hutchins pioneered early admissions of high school students to the University of Chicago in the 1930s has interest in the process of collaboration and cooperation between the secondary school and the colleges and universities been so high. The literature abounds with recent examples of advanced placement, early college credit, special workshops, honors programs, outreach projects, and professional development exchanges. Too often, however, interest has been weighted in favor of one or other institution, and initiators have been limited in their capacity to promote a mutually supporting and collaborating process which serves equally the needs and interests of both levels.

In 1981, almost one hundred years after Charles Eliot of Harvard assumed the chair of the famous Committee of Ten (a group born of the concern of the Massachusetts Classical and High School Teachers Association[1] and three New England college presidents), Ernest Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, called for a "National Panel on the College and School." "I have in mind," he wrote, "a group of educators from both levels, joined by other citizens, perhaps, to examine the crisis in the schools, conduct in-depth studies in such areas as curriculum and teaching and propose recommendations for reform."[2] In an earlier interview Boyer said, "The schools are the foundations of education. If students aren't prepared in the first twelve years there is no prospect that they can be effective when they move to college....there is a concern and commitment here I didn't see twenty years ago, not even two or three years ago for that matter."[3]

Catholic educational institutions presumably share a common vision of the Church as Teacher and a consequent particular interest in collaboration and cooperation. The Church considers it her right to educate, and "to promote deeper culture and fuller development of the human person." (Canon 807)[4] She is concerned that those involved in the apostolate of teaching will be effective in "the formation of the whole person so that all may attain their eternal destiny and at the same time promote the common good of society." (Canon 795). The same

canon urges Catholic eduators to conduct their institutions in such a way that the "physical, moral and intellectual talents" of their students may "develop in a harmonious manner."[5]

Why then are not the Catholic secondary schools and colleges more outstanding examples of collaborative articulation and partnership? In a written proposal for this conference, the NCEA task force concludes that there is "little evidence that the two groups are drawn together inexorably by a single vision, shared goal, or even a common vocabulary."[6]

In a newly published book, *The School and the University: An International Prespective*,[7] Burton Clark argues that the American high school and university, in imitation of the European model, were once closely bound together, but that two developments led to a shift in their identification. One was the United States' extraordinary commitment to universal education at the secondary level (between 1880 and 1930 the number of students in this country roughly doubled every decade), and the second was the introduction of comprehensive schools. The latter were expected to ensure educational options broad enough to meet the needs of all students living within their territorial boundaries. Both developments, Clark maintains, resulted in a difference between the goals ascribed to by American high schools and those of higher education. The secondary school in the United States became allied to the elementary school.

In contrast, Clark describes the European model in an article on the same topic:

> In Europe and elsewhere in the world, the main disjunction in the structure of education has occurred historically between the elementary and secondary levels. All children in most countries attended elementary school, but a large number of students traditionally ended their education after that. Only relatively few went on to secondary schools, which became pre-university in orientation and in program and which still today are operated on a different academic plan from the common lower schools. Upper secondary education has become tightly coupled to the university: the two levels are bound together by carefully articulated curricula and achievement standards and by an academic culture that is largely shared.[8]

While Catholic high schools reflect the social develop-

ment of American secondary schooling, they nevertheless bear some similarities to the European model. Catholic schools do not have the same pressure, as do their public counterparts, to meet the educational needs of **all** students, even of all Catholic students. Indeed, since 1970 there has been a steady annual decline in the number of secondary students enrolled in Catholic high schools. The lack of public funding and the increased responsibility of the institutions themselves to pay their own way have prevented them from being comprehensive. Consequently, their efforts are more concentrated and their focus is sharper.

One of the major findings reported by recent NCEA research on the Catholic secondary school supports this conclusion:

> Catholic high schools place a premium on academic excellence. Eighty percent of students are enrolled in a college preparatory or academic program, with only 10% following a vocational or business course of study. An estimated 83% of the class of 1983 entered institutions of higher education, a figure considerably higher than reported for public high school students.[9]

In fact, in his highly debated study comparing private, Catholic, and public schools, James Coleman asserts that the achievement of students in Catholic secondary schools is high,[10] despite their varying social and economic backgrounds, and that the educational aspirations of Catholic high school students are remarkably similar.[11]

If Clark's analysis is correct, it would seem that at least two of the more difficult obstacles to articulation between high schools and colleges and universities (universal education and comprehensive schools) are not as formidable within the Catholic school system as they are in the public school sector. It would seem also that aside from the very important aspect of mission and purpose, there are multiple curricular considerations[12] that favor successful collaboration on the part of our schools at these levels.

In a preliminary report on school/college collaboration Ernest Boyer has suggested five basic principles[13] which may prove helpful to curricular articulation, as understood in the Tyler/Taba sense, between Catholic secondary schools and institutions of higher learning:

1. "To achieve school/college cooperation educators at both

must agree that they do indeed have common problems."

In order to discuss effectively curricular problems, Catholic educators must first see themselves as ministers in the same apostolate, that of education. Too often we prove the truth of Henry Clinton Morrison's insightful comment, "As a people we do not think in terms of education; we think in terms of schools. We have no educational system; we have an elementary school, a high school, and a college."[14]

There are curricular problems in Catholic education that are shared by each of the levels in a different way; these need to be addressed, not as fragmented concerns, but as a whole. There are other problems peculiar to a given level, but which impinge on other levels. We need to see their inter-relationship; one level needs to understand the ways in which another level deals with its problems.

2. "To achieve greater collaboration, the traditional academic 'pecking order' must be overcome."

I have taught at the elementary, secondary, and collegiate levels, as many of you have, and I think we must acknowledge that there are "walls" separating us at the various levels of schooling. Part of this separation has to do with the concept of "advancement." A common notion of advancement in the educational world is to go upward on the ladder; you advance by moving upward -- elementary to high school to college to graduate school. There is a perception also that the secondary school teacher is smarter than the elementary, and the college instructor brighter than the high school teacher.[15] We in the American Catholic school community put a great deal of importance on intelligence, and this perception becomes a way of classification. Our salary scales tell us this is true.

In his book, *Don't Hold Them Back*, Baird Whitlock writes:

> The unwillingness on the part of many college faculty members to believe that secondary school teachers can teach at the college level has not changed very much. Robert Frost once said that the basic difference in postlecture parties he attended in Britain and America was that in Britain, along with the college faculty, local doctors, lawyers, clergy, and businessmen, there would always be secondary school teachers; in America this latter group was never present. For easier articulation to take place for students, the inner wall of separation within the academic community must

be broken down. The distrust will never melt away until genuine conversation between the two groups of teachers begins. And the distrust is not all on one side. High school faculties also overgeneralize abut the lack of caring by college faculty for the individual student and his or her emotional growth.[16]

Until teachers at both secondary and collegiate levels begin working together to translate the vision into a continuous curriculum, and repair the fragmented academic picture (the Carnegie Foundation speaks of a "seamless web" of education) they will miss the professionalism and skill that each has to bring to the common task. Catholic school personnel have even more at stake, for their educational goals include the reality of the schools "as 'meeting places' for those who wish to express Christian values in education. The Catholic school, far more than any other, must be a community whose aim is the transmission of values for living."[17]

3. "If school/college collaboration is to succeed the project must be sharply focused."

The National Institute of Education has identified a number of projects between high schools and colleges, falling typically into three general categories:

A. Academic Time and Content, i.e., programs that begin college work while the student is still in high school, or that allow the student to matriculate into college before receiving a high school diploma.

B. Raising Expectations, Outreach and Recruitment, i.e., a variety of pre-matriculation strategies to motivate and prepare disadvantaged, under-prepared, and/or poorly counseled students for post-secondary education, to track them into demanding academic programs, and to recruit them into college.

C. Academic Personnel Exchange and Development, i.e., programs that seek to eliminate redundancies in the secondary and post-secondary curriculum and to enrich the content of the secondary school curriculum by using college faculty development projects in specific academic disciplines.[18]

Two early examples of the first category, Academic Time and Content, are Simon's Rock of Bard College and Matteo Ricci College. Matteo Ricci, a joint project of Seattle Preparatory

School and Seattle University, moves students from Grades 9 through 16 in six years, granting a baccalaureate degree at the end of the sixth year. Both Simon's Rock and Matteo Ricci schools are "a thoughtful institutional recognition of the fact that cognitive, social and moral development is not strictly correlated with age."[19]

Syracuse University's Project Advance is generally considered to be the most successful partnership program at the present time; it is certainly the most imitated model for eliminating duplications and redundancies. Currently serving 75 high schools and 4100 students in four states, Project Advance trains high school teachers to offer college credit classes as part of their regular high school program. University and Project staffs visit each class, work with teachers, and check student papers and examinations. As a result, the curriculum of participating high schools has become more demanding, requiring adjustments in course content and structure at the university level.

Other models of the first category were singled out by NIE at the request of former Secretary of Education Terrel Bell, who asked the Institute "to review and describe educational programs preparing students who meet with uncommon success the demands placed on them by the nation's colleges and universities."[20] In addition to those described above, NIE named the Bridging The Year Program of Clarkson College, Clackamas County's Alternate College Credit Plan (a variation of Project Advance), two University of Iowa programs (The Secondary Student Training Program and The Gifted and Talented Dance Program), and the Women in Engineering Program sponsored by Michigan Technological University.

Programs of the second category, Raising Expectations, Outreach and Recruitment, recognize the fact that there are students with evident potential who have had poor academic preparation and are in need of special help to enable them to move into successful post-secondary experiences. Those cited were Project CHAMP from the University of Wisconsin-Parkside, The Middle College High School of La Guardia Community College, SOAR of Xavier University, The Early Outreach Program of the University of Illinois at Chicago, and The Migrant Attrition Prevention Program at Saint Edward's University.

The third category, Academic Personnel Exchange and Development, is directed principally to secondary school teachers and college faculties, but is not inservice in design.

Programs in this category deal most often with a specific discipline, e.g., The College/High School Teachers Interaction Project and the Illinois State Physics Project sponsored by the Illinois Institute of Technology. An informal networking of teachers from four high schools and six colleges, this group meets monthly to share ideas for improvement of teaching. Members actually work through experimentations and demonstrations with a view to finding strategies that will arouse student curiosity and interest. The Writing Teachers' Consortium, involving Herbert Lehman College and 28 New York City high schools, and the Humanists In The School Program, sponsored by the California Council for the Humanities, are two additional examples of models of the third category.

Although NIE did not identify many successful programs of the third type, theoretical interest in given areas of the curriculum is found in the literature, especially addressing the topics of waste, dupliction, articulation or continuous study of a given discipline, and failure to communicate to students the full meaning and purpose of a liberal education. I have noted articles from the various curricular areas as I researched this topic and included them in the bibliography following.

Elements from all three types of programs are to be found in *Models of School/College Collaboration.*[21] The ACCU Task Force, formed to single out schools which are "especially meritorious," makes special mention of Manhattan College in New York, Mount Saint Mary's College in Los Angeles, The Academy of the Humanities at Saint Louis University, and the Curriculum Enhancement Programs at Seton Hill and Cathedral Elementary School in Pennsylvania. As an aside, it is interesting to note that in identifying the most outstanding programs, NIE and ACCU did not agree on a single Catholic school/university partnership program.

4. "If school/college cooperation is to succeed, those who participate must get recognition and rewards."

Teachers with the College/High School Teachers Interaction Project and the Illinois State Physics Project, mentioned above, have been meeting monthly for eleven years without any extrinsic reward for participants. But it seems this group is rare. Catholic school teachers are demonstrably generous and idealistic in their service to students; they deserve tangible reward. Boyer suggests teacher recognition in the form of graduate credit, scholarships, stipends, special membership on the college faculty (as outreach or adjunct staff), honorary degrees, or na-

tional recognition. He cites Georgetown University as an example:

> Each year Georgetown University asks its students to help select outstanding high school teachers to receive honorary degrees. The program is in its third year, and these teachers receive far and away more applause than any other honorary degree recipients at commencement time. The teachers return to their schools with renewed respect from their colleagues and administrators. It is a small thing but the message it conveys is enormously important. It says that the universities not only care about quality in government and quality in business and quality in the arts, but an honorary degree to an outstanding teacher says that colleges and universities also care about quality in the schools.[22]

The university professor's contribution, too, should be recognized. Participation in collaborative efforts might figure in requirements of hours for class load, salary increment or stipend, professional honor, and/or authorship of the project report.

5. "For school/college cooperation to succeed it must be focused on action."

While we undoubtedly want to encourage more articulated programs, we need also to understand and recognize one another's educational role in teaching students at a specific level of development. This realization carries with it a sense of being a part of a greater whole, a part that connects.

I am hopeful that the regional meetings which ACCU/NCEA have proposed following this conference will include a similar idea of "connectedness," the notion that Cardinal Newman had in mind when he spoke of the educated person as one who has a "connected view of things." It is the meaning Mark Van Doren gives "connectedness" in his *Liberal Education*:

> The connectedness of things is what the educator contemplates to the limit of his capacity. No human capacity is great enough to permit a vision of the world as simple, but if the educator does not aim at the vision no one else will, and the consequences are dire when no one else does . . .The

> student who can begin in life to think of things as connected, even if he revised his view with every succeeding year, has begun the life of learning.[23]

To stimulate dialogue within the Catholic educational community on curricular connectedness, and thereby add to a "connected view of things," I propose, first of all, that ACCU, in cooperation with both the secondary and elementary school departments of NCEA, collaborate in drawing up **common goals of Catholic education**, goals to which all four levels--elementary, secondary, collegiate and post collegiate--can subscribe, each goal to be followed by objectives peculiar to each level. Individual institutions, although reflecting differing cultures, demographic make-up, and social needs, should be able to fit their specific goals and objectives into the schema. Such a schema would afford opportunity for all levels to dialogue with each other on the unique curricular contribution of each to a common educational vision.

Special attention should be given to theology in the curriculum of Catholic schools. So easy to say; so hard to do. But surely one of the key elements in the rationale justifying the tremendous apostolic effort and financial cost that the Catholic school system requires is the existence of learning communities where God is part of the reality. This question is an enormously complex one at the university level, and there is an increasingly large body of controversial literature on the subject. Suffice it to say that the Church continues to call Catholic schools to be places where the Church can think about the meaning and relationship of God to all other realities.

The former president of Harvard University, Nathan M. Pusey, expresses very well this educational and apostolic need:

> Individuals have been swept along in the advance of secularism, and have been fascinated, if also perplexed, by it. In the confusing, promising, but problem-ridden world it has created, a tragic result has been, as Sir Walter Moberly has said, 'Some think God exists, some think not, some think it is impossible to tell, and the impression grows that it does not matter.' The chief point I should like to emphasize is simply that in my opinion it does matter, hard as it is in our present situation to say this or to have it understood.[24]

My second proposal for action is that ACCU sponsor a practical program for the collaboration of Catholic colleges and universities with elementary and secondary schools in the recruiting and preparing of teachers. *The Pre-Service Formation of Teachers for Catholic Schools*,[25] a 1982 NCEA publication, was a consciousness-raising document, but it has not led to any discernible action. In 1975 the University of San Francisco designed its prototype for the preparation of Catholic school **administrators** by establishing an Institute for Catholic Educational Leadership. More than thirty Catholic colleges currently offer courses and degrees for the preparation and training of the Catholic school principal, but there is an urgent need for similar programs for the Catholic school **teacher**.

Recently the American bishops reminded the Church's institutions of higher learning that:

> The Christian formation of teachers has always been basic to the educational mission of the Church....teacher preparation programs adequate for public schools are inadequate for teachers in Catholic schools. This need is urgent and can best be met by the Catholic colleges and universities who alone possess the unique resources and desire to be of service to the Catholic community.[26]

Collaboration in the area of teacher education would necessarily raise anew the question of what constitutes the best preparation for the Catholic school teacher of today, and this from the perspectives of the professsionals themselves, as well as of their communities. It would also, it is hoped, initiate discussion within the teacher training community about the relative merits of general education, distribution requirements, and electives. In other words, a ministerial partnership between high schools and colleges would call together all three levels of Catholic education to assess together things not only as they are, but as they ought to be.

Teacher education is a good example of a curricular area in which a project of collaboration could serve equally the interest and needs of both levels. The college community needs to call elementary and secondary school teachers to greater scholarship, and to engage professors of education who are scholars. It has been charged, somewhat accurately, that professors who want to do research do not want to engage in training teachers, and those who train teachers cannot do research.[27]

These proposals have been made to stimulate discussion about possible action. Despite the Carnegie Foundation's admirable leadership in the area of continuity of curriculum, an area in which it sees mutual cooperation as "absolutely necessary," the difficulties for school/college/university partnership in public education are enormous. For us in the Catholic community, the obstacles are less awesome and the possibility of being drawn together by a common vision, an articulation of common goals, and a learning of a common vocabulary is, surely, worthy of our best combined efforts.

ENDNOTES

1. Before contacting nine New England college presidents, the Massachusetts Classical and High School Teachers' Association passed two resolutions. The first said that the lack of cooperation between high schools and colleges was an "evil" and the second predicted that increased articulation would be a "positive good." Ten years later Charles Eliot summed up the work of the Committee of Ten by claiming that its "greatest promise of usefulness" lay in its "obvious tendency to promote cooperation among school and college teachers" to "advance education reforms." Quoted in Claude M. Fuess, *The College Board: Its First Fifty Years* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950), p. 15.

2. Ernest L. Boyer, "Quality and the Campus: The High School/College Connection," *Issues in Higher Education*, Number 1 (October 1980), p. 6.

3. "A Conversation with Ernest Boyer," *Change* 14 (January/February 1982), p. 19.

4. *Code of Canon Law*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983), p. 147.

5. Ibid., p. 145.

6. Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities together with the National Catholic Educational Association, "Catholic Secondary Schools/College/Universities: A Proposal to Promote Partnership," n.d. (Typewritten.)

7. Burton R. Clark, *The Secondary School and the University: An International Prespective* (Berkeley: University of California, 1985).

8. Burton R. Clark, "The High School and the University: What Went Wrong in America, Part I," *Phi Delta Kappan*, February 1985, p. 393.

9. Robert Yeager, et al., *The Catholic High School: A National Portrait*," (Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association, 1985), p. 173.

10. James Coleman, Thomas Hoffer, and Sally Kilgore, *High School Achievement*, (New York: Basic Books, 1984), p. 158.

11. Ibid., p. 160.

12. For the purposes of this paper curriculum will not be equated with course guides, the organization and arrangement of subject matter only, but viewed as "all of the learning of students which is planned by and directed by the school to attain its educational goals." (Ralph W. Tyler, "The Curriculum Now and Then," in *Proceedings of the 1956 Conference on Testing Problems* (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1957), p. 79. Hilda Taba defines curriculum simply as "a plan for learning." (*Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1962), p. 11. Both are faithful to the etymology of the word which comes from the Latin *currere*, to run a race. Cicero used *curriculum vitae* to define a "course of life." In using their definitions, I do not imply that content is not as important as process in learning. I believe they are both important and must be intgrated.

13. Ernest Boyer, "High School/College Partnerships That Work," *Current Issues in Higher Education*, Number 4 (March, 1981), pp. 1-3.

14. Henry Clinton Morrison, "The Readjustment of Our Fundamental Schools, *The University Record* 9 (April, 1923), p. 73.

15. Burton Clark argues for more of a distinction in status among the three levels of teachers; he attributes the lack of a discernible graduation as one of the contributing factors to poor secondary school teaching.

16. Baird Whitlock, *Don't Hold Them Back*, (Princeton, New Jersey: College Entrance Examination Board, 1978), p. 34.

17. *The Catholic School*, #53, (Rome: The Vatican Polyglot Press, 1975), p. 19.

18. Clifford Adelman, "The Transition from Secondary to Postsecondary Education: A Few Exemplary Models," *AAHE Bulletin* 36 (December 1983), pp. 7-10.

19. Ibid., p. 8.

20. Ibid.

21. John Rosiak, ed., *Models of School/College Collaboration* (Washington D.C.: Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities and The National Catholic Educational Association, 1983), pp. 1-4.

22. Ernest Boyer, "High School/College Partnerships That Work," p. 4.

23. Mark Van Doren, *Liberal Education* (New York: Henry Holt, 1943), p. 115.

24. Nathan M. Pusey, *The Age of the Scholar* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1963), pp. 96-97.

25. *The Pre-Service Formation of Teachers for Catholic Schools* (Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association, 1982). This document has been useful in the dialogues between diocesan office personnel and schools of education regarding the training of teachers.

26. National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Catholic Higher Education and the Pastoral Mission of the Church* (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1981), p. 6.

27. See, for example, Clark, *The High School and the University: What Went Wrong in America*, Part I.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Curriculum Areas

1. Business

Johnson, Mildred. "Needed: Articulation Model for Data Processing. *Balance Sheet* 62 (March 1981): 250-254.

Whitney, Eugene. "Giving College Credit for Basic Business Competencies." *Business Education Forum* 36 (October 1981): 15, 18.

2. English

Collins, James L. "Training Teachers of Basic Writing in the Writing Laboratory." *College Composition and Communication* 33 (December 1982): 426-33.

LeMaster, J.R. "Defiance College Poetry Day." *ADE Bulletin* 56 (February 1978): 31-35.

McQuade, Donald and Marie Ponsot, "Creating Communities of Writers: The Experience of the Queens English Project." *Journal of Basic Writing* 3 (Spring/ Summer 1982): 78-89.

Sternglass, Marilyn. "Journal of Teaching Writing." *Journal of Teaching Writing* 3 (Fall 1984): 391-397.

White, Robert H. "A Cooperative In-Service Reading Program" *Reading Improvement* (February 14, 1977):144-149.

3. Foreign Language

Byrd, Charles W. "Academic Alliances: School/College Collaboratives." *Foreign Language Annuals* 18 (February 1985): 65-68.

de Johnson, Teresa H. "Foreign Languages in the Real World." *Foreign Language Annuals* 11 (September, 1978): 393-435.

Ervin, Gerald. "Market Research and Foreign Language Outreach: Report of a Survey." *Modern Language Journal* (Summer 1981): 178-180.

Ervin, Gerald. "Don't Hesitate--Articulate." *Foreign Language Annuals* 13 (September 1980): 397-408.

Halff, Nancy and Frisbie, David. "College Foreign Language Study Related to High School Foreign Language Study."

Modern Language Journal 51
(December 1977): 401-405.
Link, Leanor, and Mitchell, Jane Tucker. "The Grass is Always Greener: A Teacher Exchange Experiment." *Foreign Language Annuals* 11 (May 1978): 319-322.
Sachs, Murray. "Collaboration's End. Live in Fragments No Longer." *ADFL Bulletin* 16 (January 1985): 32-34.
Sachs, Murray. "Two-Way Traffic: Some Reflections on School-University Collaboration." *ADL Bulletin* 14 (September 1982): 17-19.
Twarog, Leon I. "Beyond Survival: The Role of FL Programs in the High Schools and the Two Year Colleges." *Bulletin of the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages* 8 (March, 1977): 10-14.
Webb, John. "Articulation--A Dialogue for the Future." *Foreign Language Annuals* 12 (December 1979: 465-469.

4. Journalism

Fedler, Fred. "Planning and Operating a Summer Workshop for Minority High School Students." *Journalism Educator* 35 (July 1980): 8-11.
Reddick, Dewitt C. "Relating to Secondary School Journalism: Two Problems." *C.S.P.A.A. Journal* 32 (October, 1974): 4-11.

5. Science

Greenslade, Thomas B. and Carle, Mark A. "A Model for School-College Cooperation." *Physics Teacher* 21 (December, 1983): 569-572.
Hansgen, Richard. "A Clinical Professorship." *Action in Teacher Education* 5 (Spring/Summer, 1983): 21-24.
Mattheis, Floyd E. and Byrd, William J. "Pooling Resources: A Science Teaching Cooperative." *Science Teacher* 48 (November, 1981): 48-51.
Ricketts, John A. and Kissinger, Paul B. "STEP: A Science Education Program Emphasizing High School-College Cooperation." *Journal of College Science Teaching* 12 (November, 1982): 92-95.
Smith, Jerry L. "Secondary School Utilization of Community Colleges as a Learning Center," *Journal of Chemical Education* 58 (October, 1981): 776-777.

B. Other Works

Ambach, Gordon. "The High School/College Connection: A State Perspective. *Change* 14 (January/February, 1982): 22-25.

Bandy, Irene G. "Ready or Not, High School Graduates Are Going to College." *NASSP Bulletin* 69 (March, 1985): 87-90.

Beck, John J. and Kimmel, Diane L. "Curriculum Flexibility in Small High Schools." *Small School Forum* 2 (Winter 1980): 5-6.

Boyer, Ernest and Hechinger, Fred M. *Higher Learning in the Nation's Service*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1981.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *Missions of the College Curriculum*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Casteen, John T. "Reforming the School-College Curriculum: Raising Academic Expectations." *Current Issues in Higher Education* 4 (September 1980): 6-11.

Ebel, Robert L. "What Are Schools For?" *Phi Delta Kappan* (September 1972): 3-7.

General Education in School and College. By Members of the Faculties of Andover, Exeter, Lawrenceville, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale. (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1952).

Maeroff, Gene L. "The High School/College Connection: Ties That Do Not Bind." *Change* 14 (January/ February 1982): 12-17, 46-51.

Newman, John Henry. *The Idea of a University*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1947.

O'Keefe, Michael. "High School/College Cooperative Programs." *Current Issues in Higher Education* 1 (March, 1981): 5-9.

Shive, Jerrald. "School and University Partnerships: Meeting Common Needs." *Improving College and University Teaching* 32 (Summer 1984): 119-122.

Standfield, Rochelle L. "Teamwork for High Schools and Colleges." *Educational Record* 62 (Spring, 1981): 45-47.

Trent, James W. and Jeanette Golds. *Catholics in College*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Tyler, Ralph. *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Wilber, Franklin P. "High School-College Partnerships Can Work!" *Educational Record* 62 (Spring, 1981): 38-44.

Published by the Department of Secondary Schools and the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, National Catholic Educational Association, Suite 100, 1077 Thirtieth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007.

Price: $4.00 NCEA Members
$5.30 Non Members